AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force for service as members of the Air National Guard:

Brig. Gen. Laurence Coffin Ames, AO131519, to be major general, California Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Guy Nelson Henninger, AO129883, to be major general, Nebraska Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. James Alvin May, AO356464, to be major general, Nevada Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Errol Henry Zistel, AO286558, to be major general, Ohio Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Lewis Allen Curtis, AO729140, to be brigadier general, New York Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Joseph Jacob Foss, AO944215, to be brigadier general, South Dakota Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Maurice Adams Marrs, AO274899, to be brigadier general, Oklahoma Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Winston Peabody Wilson, AO398325, to be brigadier general, Arkansas Air National Guard, to date from January 21, 1954.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to the grade indicated in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be ensigns

Charles P. Andersen
Thomas R. McCalla
Gordon R. Papritz
Ernest E. Ritchie
Gerald K. Seiple
Daniel W. Urish
Cecil C. Davis (Naval Reserve aviator)
Lee H. Sherman (Naval Reserve aviator)

To be lieutenant (junior grade), Medical Corps

Charles K. Deeks

To be lieutenant (junior grade) Chaplain Corps

Donald F. Kingsley, Jr.
Arthur J. Wartes
Jack H. Zoellner

To be lieutenant, Dental Corps

Marvin H. Scott

To be lieutenant (junior grade) Dental Corps

Ernest M. Pennell, Jr.
Paul A. Koppes
Julius E. Lueders

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

John W. Crozier, Benson.
Richard E. Lawrence, Jerome.
Ollie C. Wilson, Scottsdale.

ARKANSAS

Thomas H. Edwards, De Queen.

CALIFORNIA

Amey L. Weiser, Aptos.
Robert H. Marshall, Bakersfield.
Edwin R. Vetter, Big Creek.
Emil J. Nelson, Brookdale.
Martha L. Ward, Canby.
Carl H. Stahlheber, Chula Vista.
Charlie L. Veitch, Compton.
Ellen G. Goforth, Covelo.
Ronald L. Pascoe, Gustine.
Donald H. Onstad, Ione.
John Healy, Livingston.
Edward S. Chadburn, Needles.
William L. Klette, North Fork.
S. Merritt Williams, Palm Springs.
Eugene E. Schulenburg, Pismo Beach.
John H. Shewman, Pomona.
Warren J. Bond, San Quentin.
Louis Sibilio, Santa Maria.
Leola E. Heinz, Shingle.
Alma W. LaChambre, Sunset Beach.
Elizabeth J. Otto, Temecula.
Harold E. Rolfe, Topanga.
Blythe W. Richards, Tracy.
Charles Hugh Ross, Tulare.
Warren F. Hollingsworth, Turlock.
Roy A. Ray, Upland.
Fred H. Jenkins, Watsonville.

COLORADO

Austin C. Bledsoe, Fleming.
Phillip J. Woods, Las Animas.
Reba L. Bradley, Palmer Lake.

CONNECTICUT

Ellen S. Breining, Bloomfield.

FLORIDA

Thelma S. Speer, Boca Grande.
Bernard O'Brien, Panama City.

GEORGIA

Mattie H. Chandler, Keysville.
Lloyd C. Ricks, Macon.
Albert D. McKee, Moultrie.

ILLINOIS

Carrie L. Smith, Bellflower.
Donald W. Fraser, Blue Island.
Alan E. Rigg, Bone Gap.
Charles E. Eyestone, Brownstown.
Gertrude E. Dean, Flossmoor.
Harley Gustine, Greenfield.
Orville O. Rathbun, Gridley.
Frank A. Smallwood, Harmon.
Gregory M. Sheahen, Highland Park.
James A. Hight, Karnak.
Milo L. Craig, Kewanee.
John S. West, Lockport.
Cynthia Afton Stewart, Olive Branch.
Edgar J. Baldwin, Palos Park.
Curtis Fenton, Sims.
Harold J. Winans, Sycamore.
James L. Rousey, Wapella.
Kenneth J. Tate, Waterman.
Clifton M. Evans, Waukegan.

IOWA

Arthur M. Robinson, Bayard.
Kenneth C. Anderson, Clinton.
Ralph O. Woods, Colfax.
Louis F. Obye, Estherville.
Keith H. Radloff, Farmersburg.
Stewart L. Schwab, Guthrie Center.
Donald E. Clayton, Hamburg.
Lewis L. Welden, Iowa Falls.
James Emerson Evans, Joice.
Goldie M. Schneider, Popejoy.
Erwin G. Dieter, Rock Rapids.
Norman W. Jespersen, Royal.
Morris G. Dahl, Sloan.

KANSAS

Esther L. Thomm, Athol.
Reuben H. Moore, Holton.
Edward J. Schoenhofer, St. Paul.

LOUISIANA

Alton Leander Lea, Baton Rouge.
William C. Tucker, Haynesville.

MAINE

Ralph A. Miles, Jr., Burnham.
Arthur Atwood Anderson, Caribou.
Bentley L. Glidden, Damariscotta.
George W. Warren, Dover-Foxcroft.

MARYLAND

Nelsie M. Hannon, Accokeek.
Robert R. Ripple, Clinton.
Anna V. Groves, Glenn Dale.

MASSACHUSETTS

Martha Helen Lindsey, Huntington.
Mabel Griffin, Mendon.
John J. Gobell, New Bedford.
Emile F. St. Onge, Ware.

MICHIGAN

Lewis G. Howe, Bath.
Clair E. Courtade, Buckley.
Bernard C. Shankland, Cadillac.
Lawrence A. Olson, Coleman.
Harold J. Geers, Kent City.
George W. Crist, Litchfield.
James Martin Littlejohn, New Buffalo.
Carl E. Dennis, Rockford.
George E. Osgood, St. Johns.

MINNESOTA

Harvey M. Madson, Grand Rapids.
Keith W. Oleson, Isanti.
Darrell W. Matter, Lyle.
Carrol J. Strom, St. James.
James P. McCoy, Savage.
George H. Carrell, Zumbrota.

NEBRASKA

Eugene J. O'Neill, St. Libory.

NEW JERSEY

Wilbur F. Rue, Allentown.
Thomas Alfred Stevens, Cape May.
Margaret H. Merrill, Essex Fells.
Wilbur A. Smock, Farmingdale.
Robert F. Wichmann, Little Silver.
Richard G. Haffey, Longport.
Eleanor S. Howell, Stewartsville.
Harry Thomas Applegate, Toms River.
George R. Baldwin, Wenonah.
William C. Nestor, Westfield.
Leon E. McElroy, Woodbridge.
Louis A. Pime, Woodbury.

OREGON

William A. Rees, Fairview.
Glendora V. Smith, Grass Valley.
Walter E. Sneddon, Lowell.
Robert R. Ireland, Milton-Freewater.
Herbert R. Parker, Oakland.
James H. Grieve, Prospect.

PENNSYLVANIA

Franklin Levis Stringfellow, Chester.
William H. Anderson, Ebensburg.
Earl M. Miller, Elizabethtown.
Kathryn E. Kurtz, Leacock.
George A Paul, McConnellsburg.
Elmer B. Neff, Mount Holly Springs.
Milton L. Dodge, Smethport.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Florence M. Weiland, Marion.
Vada E. Koehne, Oldham.
Elmer R. Humeston, Redfield.
Chester A. Beaver, Yankton.

TEXAS

John Brice Jones, Baird.
James T. Jolley, Clarksville.
Dudley C. Jernigin, Fort Worth.
William X. Priesmeyer, Garwood.
Mario M. Seymour, Jacksonville.
Nell G. Pryor, Kirbyville.
Julia W. Toalson, Kyle.
Guy Wetzel, Longview.
Rufus L. Boren, Mart.
Cecil F. Sorell, Mission.
Bertrand T. Hansen, Navasota.
Frank N. Cook, Olney.
Allie M. Sanders, Scurry.
Thomas Everett McClanahan, Slaton.
Margie Hugonin, Tomball.

VERMONT

Lois G. Hughes, Bomoseen.

VIRGINIA

Fitzhugh L. Davis, Altavista.
William L. Skinnell, Bedford.
Tousley M. Hooker, Berryville.
Marian H. Gardner, Fredericks Hall.
Thomas W. Travis, Keysville.
James M. McIntosh, Orange.
Wilbur R. Johnston, Winchester.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose divine laws and beneficent purposes are the only foundation of a social order wherein dwelleth righteousness and peace, we thank Thee for this new week.

Grant that daily we may be inspired to see that the human race, which is

one in origin and destiny, must also be one in a great fellowship of good will and friendship, of sympathy and service.

Help us to understand that if our religious faith has in it the principle of the fatherhood of God then its practice must be that of the brotherhood of man.

Show us how we may hasten the dawning of that blessed time when the human heart shall be impervious to all feelings and attitudes of hatred and prejudice and bigotry.

May men and nations everywhere be partners in the moral and spiritual enterprise of building a nobler world order and may each day be radiant with the promises of a more magnanimous and brotherly spirit.

In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 25, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 27, 1954, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) entitled "Joint resolution granting the status of a permanent residence to certain aliens"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. HENDRICKSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MARCH 1, 1954.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on February 25, 1954, the Clerk received on February 26 from the Secretary of the Senate, the following messages:

That the Senate has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2175) entitled "An act to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch"; and

That the Vice President has appointed Allen N. Humphrey, Chief of the Records Management and Services Branch of the Office of the Comptroller General, as a member of the Federal Records Council vice Ellis S. Stone, transferred; and

That the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 54–8.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILL

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, February 25, 1954, he did on February 26, 1954, sign the following enrolled bill of the Senate:

S. 2175. An act to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 338)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1953, to September 30, 1953, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1954.*

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill which will authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay transportation and handling charges within continental United States for surplus agricultural commodities which are donated to agencies and organizations for distribution to needy persons.

Under the present law, CCC is prohibited from delivering the commodities to the recipient agencies. The law provides that surplus foods may be donated to school lunch programs; Federal, State, and local public welfare organizations; private welfare organizations operating within the United States; and private welfare organizations—such as CARE—for distribution to needy persons outside the United States, but the recipients must pay transportation and handling costs from the point of storage.

This bill will authorize CCC to pay not only transportation charges within the United States but also packaging and handling charges necessary to make the food available to the recipient agency, and storage charges not to exceed 30 days at the point of delivery.

The purpose of the bill is to permit CCC to deliver surplus commodities in bulk to organizations and agencies for their distribution. CCC is specifically prohibited by provisions of the bill from undertaking any of the distribution to individuals.

Although CARE and similar agencies are not mentioned in the bill, it will permit CCC to deliver surplus commodities to ocean ports within the United States and there turn them over to such organizations for relief distribution overseas.

It is far better to give food away than to let it spoil. If it is needed in our own country for distribution to needy persons, I think it should be used here. If there is more than we need for that purpose, then we should make it available for relief overseas.

If my bill is enacted, I think it will make possible a big increase in distribution of our surplus foods to needy people both here and abroad.

Latest figures of the CCC show that it has on hand, among other commodities, the following quantities of foods: 275 million pounds of butter, 290 million pounds of cheese, 482 million pounds of dried milk, 452 thousand 100-pound bags of dry beans, 551 thousand gallons of olive oil, and 8,368 tons of peanuts.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities

Be it enacted, etc., That section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1431), is hereby amended by deleting from the last sentence thereof the phrase "at the point of storage at no cost, save handling and transportation costs incurred in making delivery from the point of storage," and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding *"Provided*, That such commodities may be made available by donation in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture determines necessary or appropriate to effectuate the policy of this section including the payment by the Commodity Credit Corporation of repackaging, handling, and other services, and transportation within the continental United States from points of storage or acquisition by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the points of delivery to the recipient agencies and organizations, and storage within the United States for a period of not to exceed 1 month after delivery to such agency or organization, but the Corporation shall not incur any expense, other than such storage, with respect to distribution of the commodities after such delivery."

AMENDMENTS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO OUR SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 I introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide insurance benefits to schoolteachers, ministers, attorneys, physicians, and other professional people and to provide social-security protection for totally and permanently disabled persons who have heretofore contributed to the social-security fund and become insured, and after considerable study over several months, this bill which I am introducing, I think, makes many other amendments to the basic law that will greatly improve our entire social-security program.

First. Schoolteachers: Of all of the professional people in America, the schoolteachers over the last half century have been the worst of the underpaid group. Their salaries have not kept pace with modern times. Although they perform one of the most essential functions for all American people in helping to educate the youth of America, yet most professions and many occupations that do not require the long years of training and which are not nearly so important to the people of this country receive much more in compensation than do the schoolteachers.

Under our present social-security law, unless an entire group of schoolteachers in some State or political subdivision votes and elects to come under the social-security program, then a teacher in this profession cannot have the benefits and protection of social security.

We have recently amended the social-security law so as to make it possible for individual businessmen to make their contribution to this program and to come under the protection of social security. It is my opinion that each individual schoolteacher should have the right and be allowed to make the choice of contributing to the social-security fund and receive the benefits of social-security insurance on an individual basis. This should be allowed without any deductions whatsoever from any retirement fund that the teacher may be entitled to on a State level. The amendments in my bill which I am introducing today will provide for all of these things for schoolteachers.

Second. Up to the present time many of the professions, including attorneys, doctors, dentists, ministers, architects, public accountants, engineers, and the like have not had the privilege of coming under and participating in the benefits of the social-security program. When you think about these very large groups of professional people here in America, there can be no sound basis for discriminating against them, and it is my opinion they should have the same privilege, on an individual basis, to voluntarily contribute to the social-security fund just as a businessman is now allowed to do, and if these professional people desire to come under the social-security program they should be allowed to do so.

However, it is my opinion that these professional people, just like the schoolteachers, should be allowed to make their election upon an individual basis. The bill which I have introduced will enable all of these professional people mentioned above and several other professional groups mentioned in the bill to come under the social-security program, pay their individual contributions to the fund and receive its benefits like other American citizens that are now under the program.

Third. In thinking over basic ways to improve and enlarge the benefits of the social-security program for the American people, I have concluded that one of the most glaring defects in the present law is the failure to protect the man or woman who has paid into the fund and becomes fully insured but who, on account of accident or sickness, has become permanently and totally disabled and a charge upon his or her family or society, sometimes many, many years before reaching the retirement age of 65.

I feel sure that every Member of Congress has on many occasions known industrious, hardworking people in their home district who had for several years paid into the social-security program but who, before reaching 65 years of age, became permanently and totally disabled. This creates a very pitiful situation and one that this great country of ours should remedy. When a person has paid into the social-security program long enough to be fully insured under the present rules and regulations, if that person really becomes permanently disabled and cannot work, then I think he should receive social security insurance benefits immediately regardless of his age.

The payments of social-security insurance benefits to the totally and permanently disabled who are fully covered by their contributions to the fund should not depend upon any enabling act of any State legislature. It should be a part of the fundamental law that when these conditions exist, a person should be entitled to begin to receive his insurance benefits from the social security fund immediately and without any roadblock that might be put in the way on account of some State not passing enabling legislation to enable its disabled citizens to participate in the benefits of the fund. The bill which I have introduced provides for this protection for the permanently and totally disabled people.

Fourth. There is another far-reaching, and I think beneficial, provision in the bill I have introduced to amend the social-security law. That provision eliminates the restriction presently existing upon the amount of money a person can earn after he becomes 65, retires, and becomes entitled to receive social-security benefits.

When the social-security program was initiated many years ago, it had the foolish provision in it that if a person receiving social security earned as much as $15 per month, then that would cut him out of receiving social-security payments. Later on this work clause permitted such persons to earn $50, and there has been progressive changes for the better permitting our older citizens to work and earn money and at the same time receive their social security that they had paid for out of their past earnings along with contributions from the Government.

The unsoundness of a limitation upon the earnings of people after they become entitled to receive social-security benefits becomes more apparent as time goes on. This roadblock to earnings on the part of our older citizens has been contained in many of our pension plans, such as railroad retirement and so forth, as well as in our social-security program. In all of these instances, we have improved the situation by increasing the amount that a person who is retired can earn without losing their retirement benefits.

Although we have improved the situation, we have not entirely removed the evil. There is no basic cause why there should be any work limitation clause in the social-security law at all. If we continue to deny our older citizens the full and free privilege of working, earning, and creating wealth for themselves and the American people, we will continue to do this country a great disservice. There is no reason why a man or woman of 65, and in reasonably good health, should not continue to work and earn all they can. It helps their morale, it will enable them to live and enjoy living more, it is beneficial to their families, helpful to the community in which they live because they do many useful services, and if we could free our older citizens from this work limitation clause several million people past 65 could work and help to create wealth and prosperity for our people.

My bill provides if a man or woman becomes fully insured, has paid in all the contributions required for the number of years required, when they reach retirement age, they can receive social security and work, if they desire, and earn money without handicaps or limitations. The present administration, through the great Committee on Ways and Means that has jurisdiction of the social security and old-age assistance laws, is now and has been for several weeks engaged in a profound study of our social-security system. It is my belief that this great committee will come up with a very much broader and greatly improved social-security law.

The bill which I am introducing today upon these vital subjects, of course, will be referred to this committee for its consideration. It is my opinion that the new bill to be considered later on in this session by the Congress will provide for larger payments of social security and old-age assistance and that the fund will be more secure and rendered more nearly solvent and that the people who have paid into and rely upon social security will be greatly benefited by the new act, when passed.

I hope and believe that the members of the committee will take into consideration the improvements included in my bill and that when the new bill on social security comes out from the committee for debate upon the floor of this House, that we will find the 4 or 5 amendments contained in my bill incorporated in the general bill.

TARIFF LEGISLATION

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of my State and of the whole Northwest are also gravely concerned with several other aspects of tariff legislation. I trust Congress will give serious consideration to our problems when it undertakes any revision of our tariff structure.

A great number of our important industries and their employees are dependent on the production of goods and products which are being driven from the domestic market by cheap imports, made possible largely by low wages paid abroad.

Among these are the raising of tulips, iris, and daffodils; the tuna and Pacific ground-fish industries; the hardboard and plywood producers; and the Northwest tree-nut growers. And now imports of cheaply produced red raspberries from abroad are beginning to threaten red raspberry growers in my district.

The thousands of people directly dependent on these industries for their livelihood face critical times unless this Congress faces up to its responsibilities and realistically revises our foreign trade and tariff structures to afford them needed protection.

Just let me cite a few examples.

The two States of Washington and Oregon are the center of the production of daffodils, iris, and tulips in the United States. In my district, alone, are grown some 30 million King Alfred daffodils annually—more than are grown in all of Holland. But faced with growing imports of foreign flowers, produced at the low-wage rates prevailing there, the growers of the Northwest are facing bankruptcy. An excess of foreign bulbs are being dumped on the United States market at prices below the cost of domestic production.

As a result, in 1952, domestic growers, even after selling most of the crops below cost, were forced to destroy their unsold surplus amounting to about 25 percent of all their iris and 20 percent of their top quality narcissus.

The reason for this depression is not hard to find. A March 1953 report by the United States Tariff Commission showed that between 1937 and 1952 the import duty on narcissus bulbs from the Netherlands was lowered from $6 per thousand bulbs to $3, and the number of bulbs imported jumped from 6 million to more than 28 million. Likewise, between 1950 and 1952 the ad valorem duty on iris bulbs was reduced from 10 to 7½ percent, and the total of bulbs increased from 50 million to nearly 70 million, or about 40 percent.

Another important industry to the Northwest which is being seriously hurt by cheap imports is the manufacturing of hardboard. Six of the nine domestic producers of this vital national defense item are located in Washington or Oregon, and of seven more domestic plants under construction under the target expansion goal set by the Defense Production Administration, three are in Washington and three are in Oregon.

Now, at the very time that this tremendous Government-encouraged expansion of domestic hardboard capacity is being completed, and when current domestic markets are shrinking and a buyer's market is being encountered, the domestic industry is facing constantly increasing imports of foreign hardboard from Sweden, Finland, and Canada.

Particularly the Scandinavian hardboard has been coming into more and more ports and is being sold at lower and lower prices—far below the prices domestic producers can afford to charge.

As a result of the reciprocal trade agreements program, the United States duty on foreign hardboard was reduced from 30 percent ad valorem in 1930 to 15 percent in 1936, and since 1947 has been cut to $7.25 per ton, or not less than 7½ percent nor more than 15 percent, ad valorem.

Census Bureau figures I have recently seen indicate that through the first 8 months of 1953 imports of hardboard increased 65 percent from Canada over the like period of 1952, that they were 3 times greater from Finland and 8 times greater from Sweden.

These vastly increased imports have already had a serious impact on the domestic industry. Our producer has been forced to lay off more than 350 employees; another reports production cutbacks of 50 percent, and others have gone on 2- to 4-day workweeks or have cut down on shifts.

Another industry in the forestry field which is of prime importance to the people of the Northwest is the manufacture of plywood. The industry, likewise, is suffering from a lack of adequate protection, and plywood made in Japan, at wage rates drastically below those of our own workers, is now coming into this country in greater and greater volume.

Another great and vital industry to the Northwest, as well as to the whole west coast, is the taking and processing of fish. This includes the taking and distribution of tuna, salmon, halibut, and otter-trawl and drag fisheries. There are several thousand ships and an estimated 20,000 or more fishermen employed directly in the taking of these fish, plus many thousands more who make a living from the processing and distribution of them.

And, yet, with imports from Japan and South America growing at an alarming rate, these American ships will be driven from the seas and the American factories closed up unless relief is granted soon.

In 1953, more tuna was imported from Japan than was produced domestically. Other import threats are comparable, and will continue to become more dangerous unless protection is granted the domestic producers.

It is simply impossible for American fishermen or processors to compete with the Japanese. The average American fisherman, for example, in order to live must earn at least two times as much as the Japanese fisherman is paid. Cost of boat construction, gear, repairs, and so forth, are all much higher in this country. Foreign competition has already forced a number of fisheries and processing plants out of business or compelled them to greatly reduce operations. With many of our seacoast towns depending on the fisherman and his earnings, this depression in the fishing industry has a far-reaching and serious effect on entire communities.

The groundfish fleet in the Pacific Northwest has shrunk from some 250 boats a few years ago to only about 40 today, and imports have increased 1,100 percent since 1940, from 9 million pounds in 1941 to 102 million pounds in 1952.

Canadian fishermen and processors earn an average of 98 cents an hour, while their American counterparts make an average of $2.04 per hour.

The industry must have immediate tariff and quota protection if it is to survive, and its thousands of workers continue to earn a living.

There are many other industries, such as the raising of tree nuts including filbert which are important to the Northwest, where tariff and trade policies are critically hurting Americans.

The nut industry has consistently sought relief from the Tariff Commission under existing provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and under the countervailing duties and antidumping laws from the Treasury Department. But this relief has just as consistently been denied them.

We in the great Northwest believe firmly in trade and commerce among the nations. We will encourage it whenever it is fair trade and in the best interests of America. But we do not believe this Nation should deliberately follow a trade policy that forces American businesses to close and puts American citizens out of work; that opens up our domestic markets to goods produced at substandard wages which would be illegal in the United States.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to bear these facts in mind when it comes time to consider revisions of our foreign trade and tariff legislation.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY—BILL INTRODUCED INCLUDES RULES OF FAIR PROCEDURE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, to those who are devoted to a bipartisan foreign policy for the United States and to a dynamic and progressive domestic policy, alike, the question of congressional investigations of communism and subversion and how to conduct them must be definitely settled or we will be completely bogged down and our attention diverted from the settlement of other issues vital to national security and prosperity and world peace. Anne O'Hare McCormick, in the New York Times of last Saturday,

February 27, calls this the "No. 1 issue in American political life." Such a situation could effectively play into the hands of those who are opposed to the administration's legislative program and must have the urgent attention of those who are for the administration's program.

It is for these reasons that I am today introducing a bill to establish a Joint Committee on Internal Security to replace in the field of investigating subversion and communism the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Subcommittees on Internal Security and on Investigations of the other body having as their principal activities this kind of investigation. Rules of fair procedure are specified in my bill to be followed by the joint committee.

A vital aspect of my bill provides that the joint committee may, under conditions it specifies, delegate these investigations to other standing committees or may recommend commissions for particular investigations to be created by law. A joint committee will avoid duplication and competition between the investigating committees of each House, will better discharge the responsibility which is that of the whole Congress, will make more likely the adoption of rules of fair procedure to govern these investigations and legitimately the rights of individuals, and will best correct excesses in such investigations which have been occurring.

Congressional investigations of subversion and communism have shown such wide ramifications having a direct effect on the foreign policy of the United States, the morale of Federal employees, and the discipline of the Army, as well as involving materially industry, religion, and higher education, and almost every other phase of thought and learning, as to call for the considered responsibility of the Congress which can be best expressed through a joint committee. Nor can we overlook many right fringe and so-called native hate movements which seem to have taken a new lease on life lately, endeavoring to trade on the strains of the day.

The power to investigate is a vital part of the power of the Congress under the responsibilities apportioned to the three branches by the Constitution. It is an essential element of our freedom, and it is very important that the Congress take measures to insure that the people's confidence in it will be unimpaired.

The rules of procedure for the joint committee provide for a clear statement of the legislative objectives sought in the investigations; a major investigation to be undertaken only as approved by a majority of the committee; executive hearings to establish witnesses' credibility before public hearings which are likely to result in charges against individuals; the right of witnesses to counsel; the right of the witness or one adversely mentioned by a witness to have notice of this fact to make a reasonable statement in his own defense and to an opportunity for reasonable cross-examination and presentation of affirmative testimony to rebut testimony affecting his reputation adversely; a requirement that no individual member of a committee or employee may release reports or charges or material from a committee file except what is authorized by a majority of the whole committee; the broadcasting and televising of witnesses whose reputation is at stake or those whom they call in defense be permitted only with the consent of the witness; and that committee members or their staffs do not write or speak about investigations in process for compensation.

The bill provides for a joint committee of 14, 7 each from the House and Senate, appointed respectively by the Speaker and Vice President, and bipartisan in nature.

An additional advantage of a joint committee is that the rule of seniority need not apply in the selection of a chairman, and therefore the committee has much more flexibility in its operation. The joint committee is given the power of subpena, the right to have a staff, and all other necessary powers, all subject to the rules of fair procedure referred to above.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore granted.

FURNISHING OF INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained unanimous consent to address the House today for 30 minutes. My subject will be "I Do Not Believe the Material You Have Suggested Would Be Useful"—An Outrageous Refusal by the Secretary of the Treasury To Furnish Information of a Nonconfidential Nature to a Member of Congress.

To those who may not be able to be on the floor this afternoon because of the press of other official business, I respectfully make the request that you take time to read my remarks, believing that they will be of interest to each individual Member.

SWEETPOTATO WEEVIL AND PINK-BOLLWORM-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, southwest Louisiana, including the Third Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in this body, is one of the largest sweetpotato-producing areas in the United States. The State of Louisiana, as is well known, also produces great quantities of cotton.

An adequate sweetpotato weevil-control program and a continuation of the pink-bollworm-control project are vital to these two important agricultural industries.

SWEETPOTATO WEEVIL-CONTROL PROGRAM

The program is a cooperative project between the United States Department of Agriculture and the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Its purpose is for the protection of the sweetpotato farmers and the industry from heavy losses due to the weevil, which is the most destructive pest affecting this leading horticultural crop; and to likewise prevent the spread of the insect to weevil-free areas within these States and to other sweetpotato-growing States. The States involved are now expending approximately $409,000, or 70 percent, of the current budget program, and their ratio of manpower is 3 to 1. The States have maintained this percentage contribution for several years.

The Federal budget for the fiscal year 1955 provides for $50,800, a 76-percent reduction in funds currently available for this work, which is entirely inadequate to maintain the program in an effective manner. This problem, which is interstate in nature, requires Federal participation in program planning and coordination between States relating to surveys, quarantines, educational information, assistance in eradication and control procedures and research.

With a reduction in cotton acreage there will be a substantial increase in acres devoted to the production of sweetpotatoes, which also means additional work will be required to keep the weevil infestations to the minimum.

If the proposed budget of $50,800 is adopted it will result in the collapse of this program, causing great losses to an industry in the States now producing more than 60 percent of the total production of sweetpotatoes in the United States, which has an estimated value of more than $88 million for 1953.

This project has been successful in eradicating the weevil from some 50 counties and from many thousand farms in the affected States. In some years losses to farmers have been reduced by $2½ million or approximately four times the average annual program cost.

Therefore, it is urgently requested that a minimum Federal appropriation of $250,000 be provided for this project in order to bring about a more equitable distribution of the workload by increasing Federal manpower and equipment to assist the States in the effective control, eradication, and prevention of spread of the sweetpotato weevil.

PINK BOLLWORM CONTROL PROJECT

The pink bollworm of cotton is one of the most destructive of all insects. The amount of damage done to cotton will vary according to intensity of infestation, conditions comprising natural control and artificial control measures practiced. Probably the only reason that it does not do more damage in the United States than the cotton bollweevil is because the cotton-producing States have not become as generally infested by this pest. However, grave concern has been

expressed concerning the potential danger to the cotton industry of the United States should the pink bollworm become firmly entrenched.

This pest is now present in the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Arkansas, which was found infested for the first time in 1953. It is likewise present in Mexico. In 1952 this insect was responsible for the loss of $34 million to the cotton industry of 39 counties in south Texas.

It is estimated that an additional sum of $280,000 to the present proposed Federal budget of $1,070,100 will be needed to effectively conduct this expanded project.

During the 1953 season new infestations were found in Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. The cotton-producing South is now being threatened, and any relaxation in this program will result in severe losses to the cotton farmers. Additional funds must be provided for personnel, equipment, and travel expenses to enforce the control and quarantine regulations in the newly infested sections of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. Traffic inspection on roads leading out of the heavily infested areas of Texas and at stations along the Louisiana-Texas and Arkansas-Texas boundaries must be strengthened. The limited amount of work conducted on this phase of the program during the last 2 crop years has shown great value in intercepting large quantities of live pink bollworm, especially in baggage and cotton-picking sacks of migrant picker crews moving to noninfested States.

In 1953 an infestation of pink bollworm was found on the west coast of Mexico which definitely presents a serious threat to the cotton-growing areas of Arizona and California. Additional funds must be expended for an increase in the inspections for incipient pink bollworm infestations on the west coast and Lower California cotton-growing areas of Mexico.

In recent years sufficient funds have not been provided for making the necessary surveys in Florida for wild cotton. This is an essential phase of the program and additional funds are needed to satisfactorily conduct this work.

Therefore, it is urgently requested that the sum of $1,350,000 be provided by the Federal budget for this project. The infested and some noninfested States are now and have been providing funds for this project.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL PAY PROPOSALS

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include an address I delivered before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I made the following statement at the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee public hearing on pending postal and Federal pay proposals, March 1, 1954:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you at this time for the purpose of presenting my views as to the Withrow-Rhodes proposal to increase postal wages $800 per annum. These hard-pressed loyal employees of the postal establishment have not had an upward wage adjustment since July 1, 1951. At that time, the former chairman of this distinguished committee, and later Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Hon. Robert Ramspeck, testified that it would require a 21-percent increase in wages to bring postal and Federal employees in line with the Bureau of Labor Statistics Index in regard to the cost of living.

The actual increase granted by Congress in July 1951 fell far short of the mark and averaged somewhere around 13 percent. Since 1951, living costs have continued to rise and there appears to be no immediate relief in sight. Moreover, the Bureau of Labor Statistics representatives who appeared before this body some 10 days ago readily agreed that the wages in private industry had increased about 16 percent since July 1951.

If the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures are correct, and I believe they are in line with similar studies on the overall cost of living—then the postal and Federal workers are most certainly entitled to the modest amount proposed in the Withrow-Rhodes measure (H. R. 2344) and similar pending bills.

While expressing approval of the horizontal $800 wage-increase proposals, I am, however, constrained to withhold approval of the recommendations made by the Postmaster General on what is known as the Fry report. A complete reclassification of the postal wage structure is, of course, necessary, desirable, and long overdue. However, any proposition that affords a 35-percent wage increase to the postmaster at Chicago, Ill., and a meager increase of less than three-tenths of 1 percent to letter carriers and postal clerks in grade 3 ($10 per annum) is absurd.

If I am correctly informed, the postal authorities spent some $50,000 for the Fry & Associates report, which was hastily prepared in about 3 months. I am reliably informed that none of the representatives of the postal organizations or employees unions were consulted. Let me say that the distinguished and able members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, along with the leaders of the various employee organizations, could have done the job more effectively and without additional cost to the taxpayers.

In the absence of a proper reclassification measure, I suggest, therefore, that an immediate across-the-board increase will relieve present hardships among postal and Federal employees.

I shall be pleased to join with my colleagues in supporting the Withrow-Rhodes bill when it reaches the floor of the House of Representatives.

Again I thank you.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for today, and to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday, March 8, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

MARCH: NATIONAL SECURITY MONTH

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on this first day of March, I would like to take note of the fact that this month has been designated by the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. Arthur J. Connell, as National Security Month.

And at the same time, I wish to call attention also to the fact that during this month of March the American Legion will observe the 35th anniversary of its founding. This outstanding occasion, which will be officially celebrated on March 15–17, comes as the Legion boasts the greatest membership in its history.

Mr. Speaker, the patriotic and ever-vigilant activities of the American Legion need no extended comment—they are so well known and applauded that additional praise here would be superfluous. During the month of March when the American Legion will specifically observe National Security Month, however, I feel sure that the entire Nation will take note of and support the continuing efforts of this great veterans' organization to make our Nation secure from her enemies both within and without America.

WHERE DO WE STAND TODAY WITH COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most menacing problems facing the world today is the spread of communism throughout the world. It is reported that the Soviet Union has brought within its control behind the Iron Curtain some 800 million persons. We have sent thousands of our young men overseas in the Korean war—many of whom paid with their lives—and other military operations in an endeavor to halt the spread of communism and to prevent it from taking over the entire world.

I know of no one in public service who has rendered more outstanding and effective service in tracking down Communists and Communists saboteurs and Communist fellow travelers in the United States than J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He speaks with authority on this subject. I was particularly interested in the factual and interesting discussion by Mr.

Hoover which recently appeared in the American Legion magazine in the March 1954 issue, on the subject, Where Do We Stand Today With Communism in the United States? and I include Mr. Hoover's remarks as a part of this discussion:

WHERE DO WE STAND TODAY WITH COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES?

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation)

ANSWERS SOME QUESTIONS THAT PUZZLE MANY AMERICANS

Question. Has there been a decline in recent years in the number of Communists in the United States?

Answer. Yes. In January 1947, there were approximately 74,000 members of the Communist Party in the United States. In July 1948, the top 12 Communist Party leaders were indicted on charges of violation of the Smith Act. This was the first legal action instituted against the top leadership of the Communist Party. In January 1949, party membership was approximately 54,000. On October 14, 1949, the Communist Party leaders were found guilty. As of December 31, 1949, party membership numbered less than 53,000. On June 25, 1950, the war in Korea began; and on September 23, 1950, the Internal Security Act of 1950, which called for the registration of all Communist-action organizations, went into effect. By December 31, 1950, party membership in the United States numbered less than 44,000. On June 4, 1951, the Smith Act was upheld constitutionally, and during the summer of 1951, additional Communist leaders were indicted under this act. By January 1952, party membership totaled less than 32,000; and as of September 30, 1953, it numbered approximately 24,000. That is a decrease of 50,000 members, or about two-thirds of the total membership, since January 1947.

Question. Has there been a corresponding decline in Communist influence in the United States?

Answer. I would not say that Communist influence has declined in direct ratio to the decrease in members. The influence of the Communist movement can never be determined in terms of members. Many of the members who have dropped out of the Communist Party are still sympathetic with some of the aims of the party and can still be counted on to assist in certain phases of party work. The large number of members who have defected or have been expelled in recent years does not represent the most influential or the most devoted members. Those who now remain in the Communist Party are essentially the real nucleus of hard-core Communists who are devoted to Marxism-Leninism and are willing to obey any party instructions. Essentially they are the members who were the most influential 6 years ago. The party still has its publications, its schools, and its fellow travelers. On the other hand, the prosecution and incarceration of the leading functionaries have forced the current leadership underground, which has hurt their effectiveness. Public exposure has neutralized the influence of many other members. These factors have been a damaging blow to the overall influence of the party.

Question. What has been the greatest blow suffered by the Communists in this country in recent years?

Answer. Unquestionably, the greatest blow they have suffered has been the successful prosecution by the Government of over 60 of their leaders for violation of the Smith Act. This has deprived the party of much of its most powerful leadership, disrupted many of its operations, and heavily drained its financial resources. It has thrown confusion, uncertainty, and fear into the rank-and-file membership. It has made them realize how thoroughly they have been investigated for a long period of time and how closely their activities have been observed, with the result that they have gone underground and have invoked such strict security measures among the membership that they cannot operate nearly so effectively as in past years. It has revealed to them that some of their most trusted comrades were actually informants for the Government, which has created suspicion and distrust of their associates. It has caused many of the less devoted Marxists to drop out of the party, and some of them to make a full disclosure to the FBI of their knowledge of Communist activities. It has turned the spotlight on the Communist conspiracy against this country, so that the American public has now seen it in true perspective and has taken an enlightened stand against this foreign-inspired menace. This positive action by the Government has been and continues to be a staggering blow to the Communist Party.

Question. What is our greatest present danger from American communism?

Answer. So long as public opinion is aroused and there is widespread resistance to Communist infiltration the greatest danger lies in the moment of great emergency which would arise should the Soviets try a Pearl Harbor sneak attack. Then, by disrupting our defense program, they could do us the most damage. It is of utmost importance to the security of our Nation that we maintain a constant state of preparedness to repel successfully any attack and to deal swiftly and effectively with any aggressor. Any breakdown in our productive ability would imperil our national security now, and would create a crucial situation in the event of open hostilities. For that reason we must take every precaution to safeguard our productive might.

Question. Do you think the public has been getting a fair picture of the danger from Communists within this country?

Answer. I feel that the press, radio, television and congressional investigating committees have done much in recent years to educate the public as to the nature, operations, and objectives of communism; and the educational program of the American Legion has been particularly effective.

Question. Do you think the public now understands and appreciates the danger?

Answer. Those who are interested in learning about the Communist menace have certainly had the opportunity to become better informed during recent years; but, of course, there are many people who are apathetic about the danger and consequently have little or no understanding of it.

Question. Because of the Korean war most Americans now recognize the overall menace of armed aggression. They also know that Soviet spies have been at work in this country. However, is it not true that most Americans are hazy when it comes to Communist fronts, how they operate, and what should be done about them?

Answer. The fact that there are so many Communist front groups now operating in the United States leaves no doubt that many Americans have not checked into the underlying purpose and nature of such organizations before becoming affiliated with them.

Communist front groups are organizations of a disguised character which the Communist Party uses to further its aims. They would appear on the surface not to be under Communist control, and their ostensible objectives would seem to be entirely legitimate. Only in this way can they attract the support of many individuals who would not openly uphold a known Communist Party program.

Front groups are particularly valuable to the Communist Party as a recruiting field for potential party members, as a source of funds, as a pressure group advocating a particular Communist program and as a means of disseminating Communist propaganda. They are established either by actually organizing a new group around a particular issue or by infiltrating a legitimate existing organization. Among those who participate in front groups are open Communist Party members, concealed Communists, fellow travelers and Communist sympathizers.

Legal action has been taken with respect to such organizations. The Internal Security Act of 1950 provides that organizations determined by the Subversive Activities Control Board to be Communist front organizations, and officers of these organizations, must register with the Attorney General; and certain restrictions are placed upon such organizations and persons. The Subversive Activities Control Board has been holding hearings on certain organizations on the Attorney General's list, to determine whether they are Communist front organizations within the provisions of this act.

It is highly important that any person "Stop, look, and listen" before he allows his name to be used by any newly created organization with whose aims he is not completely familiar.

Question. You have often predicted that the Communists would go underground when things became hot. With public resentment increasing, hasn't there been a general movement from open Communist organizations to more or less nebulous front organizations?

Answer. Very definitely. Almost all Communist Party activity is being carried on in a disguised manner. Many of the top leaders and most trusted members of the party have gone underground, and the rank-and-file membership carry on party activities through Communist front organizations and even through infiltrating legitimate organizations. For example, under party instructions they have joined parent-teacher associations, church, civic, and similar groups in which you would not expect to find them. They are transferred to different sections of the country where they assume fictitious names and backgrounds and infiltrate unsuspecting groups and right-led labor unions in order to further the Communist program. Therefore it will be increasingly difficult for unsuspecting citizens to detect Communist influence in organizational activities.

Question. This, then, means a tougher problem for Americans since the fight moves into a twilight zone. Issues are confused, and the public is confused. How can communism be fought most effectively in America today?

Answer. I have always felt that an alert, informed citizenry is our most potent weapon against communism. The vast majority of Americans are patriotic, loyal citizens. They abhor treachery, deceit and any forces which would deprive us of our freedom and democratic liberties, and will not long tolerate the perpetuation of such evils. Through the schools, churches, press, and radio, the public should be given the facts about communism. Not through demagogy or appeal to their prejudices and fears, but through a clear, factual, truthful presentation, the public should continue to be informed of the real purposes, objectives, loyalties, and methods of operation of the Communist Party. Because Communist strategy is based on deceit and its true motives are concealed, communism cannot flourish under the spotlight of truth. The more fully it becomes exposed to the public eye, the more limited becomes its area of effective operations and the more restricted the number of people who will be duped into serving its evil purposes.

Along with informing the public of the truth concerning communism, and publicly exposing it as the foreign-inspired conspiracy

that it is, another effective method of fighting communism is by prosecuting Communists for violations of Federal law.

Question. Where can the private citizen go to get authentic information about organizations and individuals he suspects?

Answer. To determine the organizations which have been designated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450, one should either contact the Department of Justice or refer to issues of the Federal Register dated May 12, 1953, July 21, 1953, and October 6, 1953, which contain all designations by the Attorney General up to September 25, 1953. The fact that a particular organization does not appear on the Attorney General's list, however, does not necessarily mean that the organization is clear of subversive influence. Actually that organization may be under investigation, and an individual should be careful of what organizations he joins and should keep his eyes open to detect Communist influence. With regard to obtaining authentic information about individuals he suspects as being Communists, there is no one single source to which he can go to obtain complete information. The FBI must necessarily keep the contents of its files confidential.

Question. How can the individual assist the FBI in its investigation of subversive activities?

Answer. By voluntarily furnishing any information he may have concerning subversive activities to the FBI, and by cooperating in any way he can when requested to by the FBI, the individual is not only rendering valuable assistance but is also measuring up to the responsibilities of good citizenship.

Question. Specifically, if a person feels he has valuable information, how should he go about offering it?

Answer. He can write to me personally; he can go in person to the nearest field office of the FBI; or he can call the nearest field office and arrange for a special agent to contact him. The telephone number of the appropriate FBI office is listed on the first page of all telephone directories. He can be certain that his assistance is appreciated and that his identity will be kept confidential if he so desires.

Question. There is a certain amount of confusion in the public mind concerning the functions of the FBI. Some people feel that "we should not permit Congress to go after alleged subversives since this is a function of the FBI." Others maintain that the FBI could round up all the subversives in the country on short notice; therefore, what are we worrying about?

For the record, will you explain just what the FBI can do and what it is not permitted to do?

Answer. By Presidential directives, legislative enactments and instructions of the Attorney General the FBI has the responsibility of investigating espionage, sabotage, subversive activities and related domestic intelligence matters and of serving as a coordinating agency for the dissemination of domestic intelligence information to other Federal agencies authorized to receive it. The FBI is a fact-finding agency and does not institute prosecutive action on the basis of its investigative findings. Information reflecting a violation of Federal law is referred to the Department of Justice for an opinion as to prosecution. Any information received which pertains to the responsibilities of some other Government agency is transmitted directly to that agency without recommendation or evaluation.

While the FBI for years has exposed the Communist conspiracy, it cannot divulge the confidential details of its files as to specific individuals. A congressional committee having the power of subpena and contempt citation is able to focus public attention on specific situations.

Question. Can a person who believes that the FBI has wrongly pegged him as a Communist present his side of the case so the record shows his version?

Answer. Not only can he present his version, but the FBI welcomes any such person's coming in and relating his story. We are a fact-finding organization and we are just as zealous to protect the innocent as we are to detect those who pose a threat to the internal security of our country.

Question. Ex-Communists are held in low regard by some people who maintain that they shouldn't be trusted and their testimony is worthless. What is your experience with ex-Communists in this respect? Have these people to any great extent redeemed themselves by the help they have given you?

Answer. The assistance which ex-Communists have given to the FBI has been invaluable. Having had their eyes opened to the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, many of them have reevaluated the privileges of American citizenship, have realized the duties inherent in such citizenship, and, through making a full disclosure to the FBI of the information they possess, have made contributions of great value to the internal security of this country. The truth of their testimony has been verified by corroborating evidence. Many ex-Communists have been tested by vigorous and searching cross-examination, and their opponents have been unable to contradict their testimony. Many of them have suffered ostracism, public rebuke, and social distrust as a result of their breaking with the Communist Party and testifying against it. All religions teach that redemption is possible for any man who sincerely repents and seeks to make amend for his errors. The sincerity of a former Communist can be judged by his willingness to stand up and be counted and by taking positive action to attempt to rectify his wrongs. I am always glad to see ex-Communists make their change of conscience and philosophy a matter of record, assume earnestly the responsibilities of good citizenship and join in the fight against the evil they formerly espoused, and I welcome the information which they can furnish.

Question. We have asked about past and present dangers. Can you indicate what the Communists are planning for 1954 and later?

Answer. The Communist Party has three primary plans for future action. One is the infiltration of labor. In this respect the party is concentrating on the infiltration of right-led unions, or non-Communist-dominated unions, and labor unions in the basic industries. Its vicious purpose is both to influence the trade union movement in this country and to be on the ground floor in the event the labor movement ever forms a third major political party in the United States.

A second diabolical plan is to infiltrate and strengthen its ties within the two major political parties in this country, in order to advance more effectively the interests of the Communist Party within the existing political framework and to bring about a new political realinement in this country on the basis of which the Communist Party hopes ultimately to be the dominating force.

A third and probably the most important plan is the continuation of the so-called peace offensive. Here the Communists are attempting to capitalize on the deep desire of the American people for peace. They would lay sole claim to any real efforts to achieve that goal; yet it is their Soviet masters who make the achievement of world peace so difficult. In order that we may not be misled by Communist peace propaganda, it is important that we understand the Marxist-Leninist distinction between two kinds of peace—lasting peace, obtained only after world revolution; and temporary peace, regarded as a tactical necessity as the tide of revolution ebbs and flows. In short, the peace which figures so prominently in Communist propaganda today is a temporary tactical peace designed to strengthen the Soviet Union and to stupefy its adversaries.

Question. The lone individual often feels he can do nothing to fight communism, and in most cases there is not a great deal he can do. However, there are some things open to him. What are they?

Answer. Every loyal American citizen can and should join in the fight against the Communist menace. These are some of the things each person can do:

1. Learn the facts about communism—its history and objectives, its program and techniques in this country. The better informed one becomes, the more rapidly he can detect Communist influences and the more intelligently he can fight communism.

2. Through such media as the press and radio, keep up with Russia's stand on matters of foreign policy. The Communist Party in America will take the same position, and the party line will fluctuate as Soviet foreign policy changes. Sudden reversals in Soviet policy will cause members of the party to make sudden similar reversals in their pronouncements, which is one of the best ways to spot Communists.

3. Become familiar with the names of organizations publicly cited as Communist fronts, and refuse to join such groups, to sponsor their causes or to contribute to their fund drives.

4. Be alert to Communist tactics in unions and other organizations. Outmaneuver them. Keep them under control and in the minority at all times and attempt to eliminate or neutralize their effectiveness. Openly oppose their efforts to promulgate pro-Communist activities or resolutions.

5. Keep Communists out of official positions in schools, churches, and other institutions where they can poison the minds and influence actions of youth.

6. Exercise your privilege to vote and keep Communists and their sympathizers out of public office.

7. Develop an intelligent, participating interest in civic affairs and programs for social improvement. Don't let Communists claim a monopoly in such matters or move in and direct established programs.

8. Report to the FBI immediately any pertinent information relating to subversive activities.

9. Conduct no private investigations of suspicious persons or organizations, but leave that to trained investigators who are authorized to perform such investigations. Do not become involved in the Communist movement for whatever worthwhile motives without first discussing the matter thoroughly with the FBI and establishing a cooperative relationship.

10. Learn as much as possible about America—its history, government, culture, laws, and heritage of freedom; and make the practice of democracy its own bulwark against subversion. Speak up for America and work for America.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 18]

Abbitt	Burleson	Dawson, Ill.
Battle	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Blatnik	Campbell	Dorn, S. C.
Bolling	Chatham	Durham
Bosch	Chelf	Gamble
Brownson	Clardy	Gary
Buckley	Corbett	Gwinn

Hart	Morgan	Robeson, Va.
Hillelson	Moulder	Robsion, Ky.
Kearney	Osmers	Roosevelt
Kelley, Pa.	Patman	St. George
Keogh	Patterson	Scrivner
Kirwan	Pillion	Scudder
Kluczynski	Powell	Sheehan
Krueger	Price	Short
Lantaff	Prouty	Sutton
Lesinski	Radwan	Taylor
Lipscomb	Reed, N. Y.	Vursell
McCarthy	Richards	Weichel
McConnell	Riehlman	
Merrill	Rivers	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 7339, a bill to amend certain phases of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PAY CERTAIN DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYMENTS QUARTERLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, rated 20 percent or less disabling, shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO COMPLETE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3986) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OPERATION OF HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES LOST IN THE FLOODS OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4319) to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CITY OF CHANDLER, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1081) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

TANKERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6353) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national-defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MONUMENT IN BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 582) to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3413) to grant oil and gas in lands on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the oil and gas in land located within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., allotted on or after March 3, 1927, which is now reserved to the Indians having tribal rights on such reservation by the first section of the act of March 3, 1927, relating to oil and gas in certain tribal lands within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont. (44 Stat. 101), is hereby granted to the Indian who, on the date of enactment of this act, holds the surface rights of such land. If on such date the surface rights of such land are held by any person other than an Indian, the oil and gas therein is hereby granted to the last Indian who prior to such date held such surface rights or, if such Indian is deceased, to his heirs.

SEC. 2. No oil and gas lease which covers in whole or in part land allotted on or after March 3, 1927, is entered into pursuant to the first section of the act of March 3, 1927, and is in effect on the date of enactment of this act, shall be affected by reason of the enactment of this act, except that any rents, royalties, and other money payable under such lease after such date of enactment, which are attributable to the oil and gas granted to an Indian by the first section of this act, shall be paid to such Indian.

SEC. 3. This act shall not apply to (1) oil and gas in tribal land which, on the date of enactment of this act, is unallotted or otherwise undisposed of and (2) oil and gas in land, the surface rights of which are held on such date by a person other than an Indian, if the last Indian owner of such surface rights was the Fort Peck Tribe.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the oil and gas in land located within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., allotted on or after March 3, 1927, which is now reserved to the Indians having tribal rights on such reservation by the first section of the act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1401), relating to oil and gas in certain tribal lands within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., is hereby granted to the allottee of such lands, or, if such Indian is deceased, to his heirs or devisees: *Provided*, That if the allottee or his heirs or devisees, relinquished such allotment and received a lieu allotment of other lands in the said reservation or transferred title to such allotment to the Fort Peck Tribe and, in exchange therefor, received an assignment of the same or other lands in the said reservation, the oil and gas hereby granted shall be only that in the land in the lieu allotment or the exchange assignment, as the case may be.

"SEC. 2. If on or after March 3, 1927, the allottee or his heirs or devisees, relinquished an allotment made prior to March 3, 1927, and received a lieu allotment of other lands in the said reservation or transferred title to such allotment to the Fort Peck Tribe and, in exchange therefor, received an assignment of the same or other lands in the said reservation, the oil or gas in the land in such lieu allotment or such exchange assignment is hereby granted to the holder of the lieu allotment or the exchange assignment, as the case may be, unless the allottee or his heirs or devisees reserved the oil and gas in the lands transferred or relinquished.

"SEC. 3. Title to the oil and gas granted by this act shall be held in trust by the United States for the Indian owners, except where the entire interest in the oil and gas is granted to Indians to whom a fee patent for any land within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation has heretofore been issued, in which event the unrestricted fee simple title is hereby granted to the Indian owner, and except where the entire interest in the oil and gas is hereafter held for Indians to whom a fee patent for any land within said reservation has heretofore or hereafter been issued or who are determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be competent to manage their own affairs, in which event the unrestricted fee simple title shall be transferred to the Indian owner by the Secretary.

"SEC. 4. If the Secretary of the Interior determines that the entire interest in land, including land held under an exchange assignment, on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation is owned by Indians who are the grantees of oil and gas under this act and who are competent to manage their own affairs, he is authorized and directed to issue fee patents to them for such interest.

"SEC. 5. No oil and gas lease which was entered into pursuant to the first section of the act of March 3, 1927, which covers in whole or in part the lands referred to in sections 1 and 2 of this act, and which is in effect on the date of enactment of this act, shall be affected by reason of the enactment of this act, except that any royalties and other moneys payable under such lease after such date of enactment, which are attributable to the oil and gas granted to an Indian by sections 1 or 2 of this act shall be payable to such Indian, or if such Indian is deceased, to his heirs or devisees.

"SEC. 6. This act shall not apply to oil and gas in tribal land which, on the date of the enactment of this act, is otherwise undisposed of.

"SEC. 7. Any and all moneys collected by the tribes as advance rentals, bonus, and royalties of oil and gas leases after March 3, 1927, and prior to the transfer of said oil and gas rights pursuant to this act to said individual Indians may also be paid by authority of said executive board to the individual Indians to whom said oil and gas rights are transferred pursuant to this act.

"SEC. 8. The provisions of this act shall not be effective unless approved in a referendum by a majority of the members of the Fort Peck Tribe actually voting therein: *Provided*, That the total vote cast shall not be less than 30 percent of those entitled to vote. This referendum shall be conducted on not less than 60 days' notice under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior or his duly authorized representative."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to grant oil and gas in lands and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIRED ENLISTED AND WARRANT OFFICER PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1433) to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That enlisted men and warrant officers heretofore advanced to commissioned rank or grade on the retired list under the said act of July 24, 1941, as amended, and who were restored to their former retired enlisted or warrant officer status, as the case may be, pursuant to section 3 of the act approved June 19, 1948 (Public Law 709, 80th Congress), shall be entitled to receive enlisted or warrant officer retired pay as appropriate, from November 1, 1946, or from the date of advancement on the retired list, whichever date is the later, to the date on which they were so restored: *Provided*, That no such retired pay shall accrue to personnel mentioned in this section for periods during which such personnel received commissioned officer retired pay.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read to the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read "A bill to entitle enlisted men and warrant officers advanced to commissioned rank or grade who are restored to their former enlisted or warrant officer status pursuant to section 3 of the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 505), to receive retired enlisted or warrant officer pay from November 1, 1946, or date of advancement, to date of restoration to enlisted or warrant officer status."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2683) to amend section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. The authority of the administrator under this act to provide public works and to enter into agreements with applicants in connection therewith shall terminate on June 30, 1959, or on the date he obligates for such purposes the total amount authorized to be appropriated hereunder, whichever first occurs."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2848) to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 89. WHARVES AND LANDINGS.—The wharves and landings constructed or controlled by the Republic of Hawaii on any seacoast, bay, roadstead, or harbor shall remain under the control of the government of the Territory of Hawaii, which shall receive and enjoy all revenue derived therefrom."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5627) to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I take this opportunity, since this bill relates to research, to call the attention of the House to the fact that in our armed services, particularly some of the branches of our armed services, there is a very unfortunate situation existing in connection with our scientists. To me, the field of science, basic and applied, is a matter of vital importance not only to the peacetime activities of our country but particularly in connection with our national defense.

One of those scientists might conceive something that would save the lives of 100,000 American boys wearing the uniform. One of them might conceive something of great benefit to our country that would be revolutionary in nature not only in connection with our domestic economy and situation but particularly in connection with our national defense.

I have a great deal of respect for our scientists. They are quiet men, most of them unassuming, but they contribute greatly. Not only have they contributed greatly in the past but their future contributions will also be of great benefit to our country.

I have ascertained that many of our scientists in the armed services are very much distressed with the conditions under which they are working, where some of the military, and I shall not mention individuals, are undertaking to dominate their activities rather than to cooperate with them, each cooperating with the other.

My purpose in rising today is not to be critical, but to call to the attention of my colleagues this situation which I have been following for the past 3 or 4 years. It is not anything new. I had taken it up with former President Truman. He made some improvements. I have discussed it on the floor of the House in the past. So my remarks have no application to any particular administration, but are solely to call to the attention of my colleagues that a very sensitive situation exists. Many of our scientists have left the service of our country, and there are many others who are going to leave the service of our country because of the conditions under which they are employed and under which they are serving. You cannot apply military rule to a scientist. Some of the military have undertaken to dictate to and to attempt to dominate them. I think that is harmful to the best interests of our country. My observations are more in the nature of a warning to my colleagues, and particularly to the military, that they ought to look into the situation and ought to try to create the harmonious

relationship between the military and the scientists in the service of our country who are working with the Department of Defense so that there will be a situation consistent with the best interests of our country. So, I repeat, this is not the time to criticize. But I am very much disturbed and alarmed at the potentialities. I hope the military will recognize that while the scientists must cooperate and they will cooperate, the military cannot dominate men of that type.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, pertinent to the observations made by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think it is well for me to call the attention of the House to one point at this time, which is of deep interest to the country and to the world at large regarding scientists, and that is the fact that we have men in the National Institute of Health who are invited by other countries to visit those other countries—not at the expense of the United States, but at the expense of the foreign country. Their transportation and their keep is paid for by the foreign country. All that these men are asking is that they be allowed to travel at the expense of these foreign countries, but that they be not deprived of their wages and that the time consumed in making the trip not be charged to their annual leave. They ask that they be continued on the active payroll because they are not being paid for their time while they are abroad. While they are abroad, they are simply having their expenses paid. I know of one case in particular where one man is supposed to go abroad to lead a symposium on one of the very critical diseases. I am not going to identify the man because I do not want any repercussions. His application has been pending now for 6 months, and unless action is taken very promptly, he will not be able to get reservations to go abroad and lend his experience to this symposium on this particular disease in which all of us are vitally interested. I took up this question with the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education on a general scale about a year or so ago. I was told then that, of course, such leave could be granted and that the man would not lose his pay while abroad. But, no action has been taken on this particular case. Unless some action is taken very shortly, I intend to publicize this matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the few guarded remarks and observations that I have made, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of Public Law 472, 81st Congress, is amended to read "The total of the sums expended pursuant to this act, including all sums expended for the payment of salaries or compensation to employees on leave, shall not exceed $100,000 in any fiscal year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCLUSION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPRESENTATIVE AS A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7541) to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 271, 63d Congress, approved March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 930; 50 U. S. C. 151a), as amended, be amended by striking out "the chairman of the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense" and inserting in lieu thereof "one representative of the Department of Defense, from the office in charge of research and development."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO COOPERATE WITH THE STATE OF KENTUCKY TO ACQUIRE NONFEDERAL CAVE PROPERTIES WITHIN THE AUTHORIZED BOUNDARIES OF MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 79) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF TUCSON, ARIZ., AND TO ACCEPT OTHER LAND IN EXCHANGE THEREFOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1160) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Tucson, Ariz., a municipal corporation, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that tract of land situate in the county of Pima, State of Arizona, described as that portion of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 24, township 14 south of range 13 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Pima County, Ariz., more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the south line of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 24, distant three hundred forty-five and nine-tenths feet westerly from the southwest corner of said northwest quarter of the northwest quarter; run thence westerly along said south line, a distance of one hundred forty-four and one-tenth feet to a point; run thence northerly and parallel with the east line of said northwest quarter of the northwest quarter, a distance of two hundred ninety and four-tenths feet to a point; run thence easterly and parallel with the south line of said northwest quarter of the northwest quarter, a distance of one hundred forty-three and fifty-five one-hundredths feet to a point; run thence southerly a distance of two hundred ninety and four-tenths feet, more or less, to the point of beginning;

and to accept in exchange therefore a conveyance in fee simple to the United States by the city of Tucson, Ariz., a municipal corporation, of the following described real property situate in Pima County, Ariz.:

The east one hundred and ninety feet of the south two hundred ninety and four-tenths feet of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 24, township 14 south of range 13 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Pima County, Ariz.

SEC. 2. The deed of the land conveyed by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the provisions of the first section of this act shall contain express conditions—

(a) that the city of Tucson shall agree, upon the receipt of the deed from the Secretary of the Interior, to demolish the existing structure on such land; and

(b) that all salvage therefrom may be removed by the Papago Council of the Papago Tribe of Indians without the council paying for the same.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASING OF LANDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1570) to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 50 years.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso in the first section of the act entitled "An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That the Territory may, by general law, provide for leasing said land in area not to exceed one section to any one person, association, or corporation for not longer than fifty years at any one time:".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "fifty" and insert "fifty-five."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational

purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 55 years."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ADMISSION OF CITIZENS OF THAILAND AND BELGIUM TO UNITED STATES MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the resolution (S. J. Res. 34) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to permit within 1 year after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, 2 persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

SEC. 2. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Army, the said persons shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Army by reason of their graduation from the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to subject the said persons to the provisions of section 1320 of the Revised Statutes or to section 3 of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 304; 10 U. S. C. 1092c).

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to permit within 1 year after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such legislation.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to permit within 1 year after the enactment of this joint resolution, upon designation of the President of the United States, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

"SEC. 3. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Army, in the case of persons attending the United States Military Academy, or the Secretary of the Navy, in the case of persons attending the United States Naval Academy, the said persons shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy or midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, appointed from the United States, but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Army or the United States Navy by reason of their graduation from the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to subject the said persons to the provisions of section 1320 of the Revised Statutes or to section 3 of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 304)."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: On page 2, line 20, strike the last word of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the word "instruction."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO CITY OF ST. JOSEPH, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7402) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey to the city of St. Joseph, Mich., upon payment by such city of $3,300, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lot No. 112 in such city (being a portion of the property which was formerly known as the St. Joseph Lighthouse Reservation, Mich., and which was conditionally conveyed to such city by the Secretary of Commerce under the act of May 28, 1935), notwithstanding any conditions or limitations imposed by section 17 or section 36 of such act (49 Stat. 307, 311) or by the deed of conveyance issued thereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "city," insert "for use as a parking lot."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY TO STATE OF INDIANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 232) to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Indiana, upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth in section 2, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land (hereinafter referred to as Federal land) situated in Marion County, Ind., together with all fixtures and improvements thereon. Such land, which is surplus to the requirements of the United States, comprises a part of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 20, township 15 north, range 3 east, Marion County, Ind., known as Tent City, and is more particularly described as follows:

(1) Beginning at the southwest intersection of Wade Avenue with Main Street as shown on plat of Thurston Place Addition, said point being the northeast corner of the tract of land herein described, thence running south along the western right-of-way line of Main Street a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue; thence running in a westerly direction along the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue, a distance of hour hundred and fifty-five and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to a point in the east right-of-way line of a fifteen-foot alley; thence running north along said east right-of-way line of said fifteen-foot alley a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue; thence along said south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue a distance of four hundred fifty-five and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to a place of beginning and containing four and seventy-eight one-hundredths acres of land more or less (tract 1);

(2) Beginning at the southeast intersection of Wade Avenue with Main Street as shown on plat of Thurston Place Addition, said point being the northwest corner of the tract of land herein described; thence running south along the eastern right-of-way line of Main Street a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue; thence running east along the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue, a distance of nine hundred twenty-five and forty-six one-hundredths feet to a point in the west right-of-way line of Holt Road, thence running north along the west right-of-way line of Holt Road a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the south right-of-way of Wade Avenue, thence running west along the south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue a distance of nine hundred twenty-five and forty-six one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning and containing nine and seventy-three one-hundredths acres of land more or less (tract 2); and

(3) All the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all streets, highways, alleys, ways, and rights-of-way which may or do adjoin or abut the said land—the land described in this section is the same land that was acquired by the United States by deed dated December 7, 1942, recorded in the land records of Marion County, Ind., in volume 1103 at page 599, and shown as tracts 1 and 2 on the military real estate map of Stout Field, numbered 1627, approved July 6, 1945, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. The conveyance of the Federal land provided for in the first section shall be made upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth as follows:

(1) In time of war or of national emergency heretofore or hereafter declared by the President or the Congress, and upon the request of the Secretary of Defense to the State of Indiana, the United States shall

have the right to the exclusive or nonexclusive use of all or any part of the Federal land, for the full period of such war or national emergency without cost to the United States. Upon the expiration of such war or national emergency the use of the Federal land shall cease in favor of the State of Indiana.

(2) In consideration of the conveyance of the Federal land, the State of Indiana shall agree not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain land or improvements thereon (hereinafter referred to as State land) comprising Stout Field, situated in sections 17, 18, 19, and 20, township 15 north, range 3 east, second principal meridian, Marion County, Ind., and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point at the center of section 17, township 15 north, range 3 east, second principal meridian, said point being the intersection of the center line of Minnesota Avenue and Holt Road; thence south along the north-south center line of section 17 and the center line of Holt Road three thousand four hundred ninety-three and fifty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point, said point being the intersection of the center line of Holt Road and Wade Street; thence in a westerly direction along the center line of Wade Street extended three thousand four hundred forty-five and eighty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point; thence in a northerly direction nine hundred thirty-two and thirteen one-hundredths feet to a point on the north line of Raymond Street extended, said point being two hundred nineteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet east of the east line of Denniston Street; thence in a westerly direction along the north line of Raymond Street extended two hundred nineteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet to a point in the east line of Denniston Street; thence north along the east line of Denniston Street one thousand one hundred sixty-five and twenty-one one-hundredths feet to a point; thence in an easterly direction along a line parallel to Lagrand Avenue eight hundred fifty-nine and thirty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of Roena Avenue; thence north along the east line of Roena Avenue one thousand four hundred ninety-three and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet to a point on the east-west center line of section 18; thence in an easterly direction along the east-west center line of sections 18 and 17, and the center of Minnesota Avenue two thousand seven hundred ninety-one and eight-tenths feet to a point of beginning; containing two hundred fifty-eight and ten one-hundredths acres, more or less; and being the same land under lease to the United States from 1942 to December 31, 1946, covered by lease contract numbered W2215-ENG-69, between the State of Indiana and the United States, executed April 7, 1942; shown as tract 4 on the military real-estate map of Stout Field, numbered 1627, approved July 6, 1945, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

(3) In time of war or of national emergency heretofore or hereafter declared by the President or the Congress, and upon the request of the Secretary of Defense to the State of Indiana, the United States shall have the right to the exclusive or nonexclusive use of all or any part of the State land for the full period of such war or national emergency without cost to the United States. Upon the expiration of such war or national emergency the use of the State land shall cease in favor of the State of Indiana.

(4) In the event that the State of Indiana shall at any time sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, or shall attempt to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, all or any part of the State or Federal land without the consent of the Secretary of Defense, all of the right, title, and interest in and to the Federal land shall revert to the United States without cost.

SEC. 3. Nothing herein contained shall prevent the State of Indiana from granting leases of said lands and rights and easements therein and thereon without the consent of the Secretary of Defense providing any such leases, rights, and easements are made subject to the right of use thereof by the United States during war or national emergency.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 9, after the word "land", insert the words "and all improvements thereon."

Page 7, line 1, after the word "land", insert the words "including any improvements thereon."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This completes the bills on the Consent Calendar today.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 450 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 355, amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 19]

Battle	Dorn, S. C.	Lantaff
Bentsen	Durham	Lesinski
Bolling	Gamble	Lipscomb
Brownson	Gary	McCarthy
Buckley	Gwinn	McConnell
Byrne, Pa.	Hart	Merrill
Campbell	Hillelson	Morgan
Chatham	Holifield	Moulder
Chelf	Kearney	Osmers
Clardy	Kelley, Pa.	Patterson
Corbett	Keogh	Pillion
Coudert	Kirwan	Powell
Dawson, Ill.	Kluczynski	Price
Dingell	Krueger	Prouty
Radwan	Roosevelt	Vursell
Richards	St. George	Wainwright
Riehlman	Scrivner	Weichel
Rivers	Sheppard	Wharton
Robsion, Ky.	Short	
Robeson, Va.	Taylor	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HILLELSON (at the request of Mr. SHEEHAN), for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCHENCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL to extend his remarks in the RECORD following the legislative program and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. YORTY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include resolutions.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernment Relations.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a great many Members are not familiar with the fact that there are at present high-level negotiations going on between the Mexican Government and our Government regarding Mexican labor coming across the border. I cannot understand why this particular resolution is called up today.

At this very hour a friendly nation—Mexico—is now trying to negotiate with United States representatives the very thing that this resolution seeks to accomplish. Before the Rules Committee last week it was revealed and admitted by one of the proponents of this legislation that you might term this bill a weapon with a little weight in it in order to try and pressure Mexico in the negotiations with our country regarding some of their so-called wetback farm labor. My definition of a weapon with a little weight is what is known as a blackjack.

I wonder if the Members of this House realize that last year over 580,000 illegal immigrants were sent back across the border, and most of those illegal immigrants were caused by this so-called wetback situation.

With the exception of maybe 5 States that are interested in this cheap labor, I would like to ask the Representatives of the 42 or 43 other States what they are going to say to their people about reports of unemployment which appeared in last week's papers? On February 25 of last week the Washington papers said there were 59 critical areas of unemployment in this Nation. Why should we let down the bars now to have legislation passed that will eventually this year mean thousands of workers from across the Rio Grande border coming into this country to take over jobs that millions of unemployed Americans are entitled to? Why this resolution is up here today I do not know, because this dispatch from this morning's paper states:

> The Mexican Embassy announced today that an agreement has been reached in Mexico City for provisional 6 weeks' extension of the terms under which farm workers from south of the border may accept jobs in the United States. The Embassy statement said that an understanding has been reached on almost all points under consideration on a continuing bilateral agreement.

If the agreement is signed this bill is absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I cannot yield at present; I will later if I have time.

Let me read from a February 25 newspaper article, and this article appeared in the Washington newspapers.

> These groups promised to work to facilitate an agreement by their governments. They were the Associacion Nacional de Cosecheros of Mexico and the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange. The National Farmers Union was represented by its president, James Patton, at the Tuesday morning conference but did not participate in later meetings.
>
> Allan B. Kline, AFBF president, is also president of the IFAP and presided at the sessions.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the farm organizations, the labor organizations are cooperating to bring about an agreement between our Government and Mexico on this labor question. The passage of this bill may jeopardize the success of these high-level negotiations.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Not right now.

The press this morning states that our Secretary of State today is down in South America with a very delicate and difficult international task to perform. I can almost read the headlines in South America tomorrow morning. They will say that our Congress passed a resolution in order to pressure the Mexican Government to sign a contract on an agreement that concerns their nationals.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. COOLEY. I think my chairman was about to ask the gentleman whether he meant to say that the farm organizations were opposed to this resolution.

It is a fact that the farm organizations—the Grange and the Farm Bureau—submitted a very feeble and a very brief endorsement of this legislation when we were having hearings. But the gentleman is calling the attention of Members of the House to the fact that last week the big farm organizations had a 3-day meeting in Washington and everyone came out against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. They came here and they met with the labor organizations of Mexico and came out against it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I would like to read for the benefit of the Members of the House what Attorney General Brownell stated in an interview held at San Francisco, and this is chronicled in the New York Times of August 17, 1953. Brownell stated at that time:

> In San Francisco, as in San Diego, Los Angeles and the San Joaquin Valley, Mr. Brownell said he had talked with scores of Californians intimately acquainted with the yearly "invasion" of Mexican nationals.
>
> "It develops from the conferences," he said, "that the problem is increasing. The number of wetbacks entering the country is at an all-time high. Rackets are developing in the importation of labor. It has all the earmarks of developing into a number one law enforcement problem, and it is going to take the coordinated efforts of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials to combat this problem."

Now, I wish you would listen to this. It was only 2 years ago that the Congress knocked three-million-some-odd-thousand dollars out of an appropriation to give us sufficient protection at the border, to keep aliens from coming across the border unlawfully.

Here is what Attorney General Brownell said:

> The Attorney General said that, in his opinion, congressional economies that cut the United States Border Patrol from 1,627 to about 1,100 members were penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Just 2 years ago this Congress committed that act.

The Attorney General went on to say:

> For every dollar saved in that way, $20 must be spent later in American law enforcement.

Let me tell you something more. In the city of Chicago the Immigration Department is having trouble with thousands and thousands of illegal immigrants who have infiltrated into Chicago by reason of this so-called cheap labor across our border.

Let me call your attention to what Mr. McBee, who is in charge of immigration out in California, said:

> One smuggler, his men captured near El Paso broke down, confessed he was part of a nationwide ring headquartered in Chicago.

If they are headquartered in Chicago, they are headquartered in Detroit, Los Angeles, Seattle, New York, and other places.

Mr. McBee went on to say:

> He named names, even told authorities of a restaurant on Chicago's South Halstead Street, in the city's Skid Row, where he delivered aliens for employment in industrial plants.

These aliens that are being admitted under this program are infiltrating into every industrial area in America. With 59 critical areas of unemployment in America today, I think it is about time to call a halt to this fiasco that goes on every year with regard to these wetbacks and cheap labor from across the border.

Mr. Speaker, February 7, 1954, the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, S. T. D., archbishop of San Antonio, Tex., member of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, sent the following telegram to Chairman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of the House Agriculture Committee:

> House Joint Resolution 355 is calculated further to embitter our relations with Mexico. There are more than 2 million unemployed bread winners in our country today. There are thousands of unemployed Puerto Ricans in Chicago who are American citizens. In south Texas we have tens of thousands of Mexican Americans who will gladly work in agriculture for decent wages. When the Federal Government recruits illegal aliens for employment, it posts a reward for crime against the United States. We hope that Congress will not attempt to legalize lawlessness.

Similar protests were filed by the Federal Council of Churches and other civic and welfare groups, and also by the AFL and CIO, and Labor, railway labor is also opposed to this measure.

I also wish to include with my remarks the following telegram received by me from the State chairman of the American GI Forum of Texas:

> DEL RIO, TEX., *February 27, 1954.*
>
> Honorable Representative RAY MADDEN,
> *Democrat, Indiana,*
> *House Office Building:*
>
> The American GI Forum of Texas, Mexican-American Veterans, and civic organization, dedicated to the betterment of the Southwest's 3 million Spanish-speaking citizens, highly praises your sincere and truthful stand on the proposed bracero resolution.
>
> No one knows better about the welfare of our Texas farm laborers, the majority of whom are Americans of Mexican descent, than Archbishop Lucey, who has seen their poverty and squalor caused by the unfair and illegal competition of wetbacks and braceros, who provide a vast reservoir of cheap, and I mean cheap, farm labor for the greedy farming interests who have become rich overnight through use of alien labor.
>
> We are thousands of voters, thousands of Americans who depend upon farm wages for our daily tortillas. We cannot be heard in our Congress because we do not have the money to send delegations to present our

side. We hope you will help our people, many of whom in the thousands are unemployed.

Failure of the administration as well as Congress to adequately provide for border patrol and detention facilities is congressional and administration blessing to cheap-labor subsidy for southwestern farmers and ranchers, as well as utter disregard for Nation's security in allowing a wide-open border to exist.

Our Government should spend money in marshaling our own farm labor pool. Domestic farm labor needs employment and our retail business needs their farm dollars. It is high time Congress thought of our own workers and their welfare, and not favoring minority Southwest agricultural interests with cheap labor.

Border recruitment will not stop wetbacks. Denial of employment to wetbacks is solution. Wetback business has produced rackets of employment agencies in illegal labor.

Suggest Congress read our report, What Price Wetbacks.

CRISTOBAL ALDRETE,
State Chairman, American GI Forum of Texas.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, before you can begin a discussion, quite often it is well to have a definition of terms. We have been using the term "wetback" here rather indiscriminately. To me a wetback is a Mexican national who comes into this country illegally, one who comes across the border without proper authorization by this Government and by its Immigration Service.

This bill does not deal with wetbacks except indirectly. The bill, if passed, will certainly have a very distinct effect upon keeping wetbacks from coming into the United States. These people come over here because there is work to be had. They want the work. No matter what anybody says about the unemployment situation in the East, the fact still remains that, according to the figures of the United States Employment Service, there are not enough agricultural workers in the States of Arizona and California. Any unemployed persons in those States are certainly given the opportunity to apply for these jobs. But they do not want this particular type of work. It is stoop labor; it is the type of worker who goes into the vegetable fields and pulls weeds and thins vegetables, pulls cotton, picks cotton. We just do not have that type of person available to do the work that is required, and it has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, and it is true, that without some legislation of this type there will be a lot of crops in the great West that will not be harvested.

The people from Mexico who come into those States legally under this bill are known as braceros; they are not wetbacks. They are recruited by the United States Government and the Mexican Government under the present agreement with Mexico. They are brought into this country and they are given contracts with farmers providing for them to receive the prevailing wage, providing for their living conditions, even providing for insurance for them while they are here. They are well treated. This is not slave labor. These people get the prevailing wage which is paid in the area in which they are going to work for the type of work they do.

So, I just want to make this point very clear. This is not wetbacks we are dealing with. This bill has a twofold purpose: One is to provide for this type of labor to come into the United States, which is so badly needed, and the second one is by allowing these people to come in legally, to deter them from coming in illegally. This will help the United States border patrol to do its work rather than hinder it. Under this law it will become necessary, in the event we cannot make an agreement with Mexico, for the United States to recruit this Mexican labor at the border. But what happens if this becomes law? It does not mean that these Mexican workers will come over here with no protection whatsoever. It means rather that they will be recruited at the border. They will receive the same contracts they now receive under the present existing arrangement with Mexico. They will receive the prevailing wage, and all the other benefits which they are now getting. The only difference that this makes is that if we cannot perfect an agreement with Mexico we will then be able to recruit at the border instead of recruiting inside of Mexico, and we will be able to bring these people over to do this work which has to be done, and they will be very well treated.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Is it not a fact that we have had this program in operation a number of years and it has worked satisfactorily in the States where it has operated?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes. It was in effect in World War II; that is, this agreement was in effect, not in this particular form, during World War II, and in this form since 1948, and under this agreement it has worked out very well as the gentleman from Colorado has stated, and we have had a lot of these people come into the country. They have been well treated, and actually I think that the relationship between the United States and Mexico has been improved because of this contract's existence rather than hindered by it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to compliment the gentleman on bringing out the fact that this legislation will help solve the wetback problem.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It very definitely will.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Instead of aggravating it, it seeks to eliminate it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman tell the House, if he has information, how many Mexican farm laborers have been brought into the United States annually during the last 3 years?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think in response to the question of the gentleman, Mr. Siciliano of the Labor Department stated that under this program there have been 200,000 brought in in the past year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The difficulty in getting the number of workers is that they go back and forth across the line. But the point I wanted to bring out with that no single worker could be brought in under this program, and I ask this as a question, if there were not a certification that there is no United States labor available.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is absolutely correct. The United States Employment Service has to certify that this labor is needed in a particular area before anybody can get any Mexican braceros. If there are American laborers available to do this particular type of work, then no Mexican can be brought into that particular area.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. In addition to the provision in the basic law itself it is well to point out that the contract which is signed provides that whenever the Secretary of Labor or his duly authorized representative determines that United States workers are available to fill the job for which the worker has been contracted, this agreement may be terminated by the Secretary or his duly authorized representative. Is not that protection for the American laborers?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct. Even if the people are here under contract, if the labor situation changes so that there are American laborers available, then the Secretary may terminate the contract at any time and send the Mexican labor back.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Has the gentleman given any thought to the question of the extent to which the absence of such Mexican labor would affect the farm surpluses of the United States?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. All I can say in answer to that is that if these people are not in my particular area we are going to have a lot of crops that are not going to be harvested. If the gentleman has anything against the farmers in my area, that is one thing.

Mr. DONOVAN. Perhaps I will have to ask that question of someone a little more familiar with the situation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have found that if I ask a silly question, I quite often get a silly answer.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. PATTEN. May I answer the question of the gentleman from New York by saying that where we have these crops that have to be harvested, it does not make any difference whether there is unemployment in some other locality.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will reject this rule. It certainly seems to me to be a most inopportune time to consider legislation which will have the effect of antagonizing a friendly nation, particularly in view of the fact that this friendly neighbor, after we have received his people, may refuse to take them back. Unless there is a bilateral agreement, there is no assurance that any of these people, once they have gotten into the United States, no matter how, will ever go back to Mexico. This bill places a premium on the ability to cross the border surreptitiously and hide. It gives to the skilled evader an opportunity to come to the United States and remain here. This is particularly serious in the case of people who are suffering from communicable diseases, who bring narcotics with them, who are felons, and who belong to Communist organizations. All protective measures of our immigration laws go out the window. After we get the people, it may well be that the Mexican Government will say, "You have given them a job, now you keep them. They are the kind of people that we do not want back in Mexico." If a bilateral agreement, which I have supported on other occasions, is reached, then, of course, this very serious problem cannot arise. It seems to me we ought to wait until such time as it is determined whether or not the United States and Mexico can reach an agreement.

I call your attention to the language in this resolution—"after every practicable effort has been made by the United States to negotiate and reach agreement on such arrangements." What does that mean? Who passes on the question of whether or not "every practicable effort" has been made? I know that the adoption of this resolution will mean the termination of all attempts to reach an agreement and that our country will be flooded by thousands upon thousands of people who will never return to Mexico. We can certainly wait until it is determined what the outcome of these negotiations are before we act upon a matter which is as serious as this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I had not expected to speak on the rule, but I cannot refrain from doing so because of the statements which were made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] with reference to the position of the farm organizations on this legislation. I hold in my hand a copy of the hearings on this legislation. In these hearings there appear the statements of Mr. Matt Triggs, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Mr. John J. Riggle, representing the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, both of them not feebly—as stated by the gentleman from North Carolina—but strongly endorsing this legislation. Also in the hearings you will find a letter from Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, approving the legislation, and urging its passage.

In addition there are numerous telegrams, statements, and letters in the hearings from local and regional farm groups and organizations endorsing this measure. No farm organization appeared in opposition.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that it is brash and it is improvident to bring this rule up today. We say in effect to Mexico, "Treaty or no treaty, we are going to bring these wetbacks in." We just thumb our nose at Mexico. That is most rude and unpleasant. Our action in passing this bill will have improvident repercussions.

I wonder what Secretary of State Dulles is going to say to justify this kind of action when he meets with the South American and Central American delegates at Caracas in a few days.

Beyond that, I want to state that this bill ought to be called not a wetback bill but a "redback" bill. Colonel Habberton, Acting Commissioner of Immigration, said recently before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for State, Justice, and Commerce, as follows:

> It was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area; also that the number of present and exmembers of the Communist Party residing immediately across the border from El Paso number about 1,500, and it has been established that there exists active liaison between the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist Party in the United States.

Such threat to national security should at least cause us to hesitate.

Here are some other results, according to Colonel Habberton:

> Results of the mass movement of wetbacks across the border are unemployment of displaced domestic labor, depressed wage scales and living standards, and creation of serious crime, health, and sanitation problems. Complaints at these results and requests for remedial action come from all levels of population, and local governments. The aliens show a tendency to quit their former attitude of docility and to assume one of defiance, obstruction, and resistance. Farmers fear for the safety of their women and children in isolated farm homes when groups of aliens appear and demand food, where they formerly begged for it. Wetbacks are making heavy contributions to the local jails, public hospitals, and even relief rolls. Their depredations range from harvesting food crops at night for subsistence, to robbery and rape. The Los Angeles Police Department reports that their officers apprehended last year 4,503 aliens who were turned over to the Service for processing as illegal entrants, which figure does not include many wetbacks who were arrested for criminal offenses and prosecuted in the courts instead of being merely booked for this Service. One thriving farm community near Los Angeles reports 4 out of 5 of the defendants in its police court are wetbacks.

This is indeed a novel procedure. We give the green light for Mexican workers to come across, treaty or no treaty. I think Congress is being used as a catspaw for the ranching, cotton, and fruit tycoons principally from Texas and California. We close the borders and ports in the North against possibility of subversives entering but along the Mexican border we deliberately leave the gates open. And now we do not even have the restraint of a treaty with Mexico. That country will say: "Since there is no treaty, we disavow responsibility for saboteurs entering the United States. We shall not take them back. They are your responsibility." Thus these Communists remain with us.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how this jibes with President Eisenhower's labor policy and our unemployment figures and how Governor Shivers feels about this. The Governor at his ranch is a notorious employer of illegal wetbacks at starvation wages. The present determined attempt of his Republican leadership to force this bill on us is passing strange.

Mr. CELLER. Certainly in view of our unemployment, especially farm-labor unemployment, and relief demands, bringing in Mexican wetbacks, who will accept substandard wages, is, to say the least, most ill-advised. Why the Republican leadership does all this is, as you say, passing strange. The voters will remember next November. Assuredly President Eisenhower could not reconcile his desire for friendly neighbors and this attitude of thumbing our noses at Mexico. As to Governor Shivers, he must answer for himself. If he employs illegal wetbacks, I hope the voters of Texas will find out and put "finis" to his political career.

Why should we not wait and see whether an agreement can be reached with the sovereign State of Mexico before we take this most unusual step of holding a gun to Mexico's temple and saying, "Stand and deliver; you will give us what we want; we will take nothing else."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio have their share of problems. But I am not an authority on their problems and I have never taken up the time of the House to try to impose on its membership what I believe to be the solution to their problems. But several of the Members from these States are representing themselves as experts on the problems of my district, in particular, the wetback problem. This is a most difficult problem and one that I have lived with all of my life on the border. It is a problem I know must be solved.

This legislation, although certainly not perfect, is a step in the direction of cutting down the number of wetbacks illegally entering our country. If we provide a simple, fair contract to farmers and employees alike there will be no incentive for the use of illegal labor. The labor contract provides a stable, legal force which will be available only in times of local labor shortages and will be returned to Mexico when sufficient

local labor is available to take care of our harvest problems. Certainly, the farmer would be encouraged to use legal labor and would find it to his advantage to abstain from the employment of wetbacks which are subject to being picked up in the fields, and therefore, a most unreliable source of labor from his standpoint.

We have tried for many years to keep out illegal aliens by enforcement measures and have not been successful. The condition in Mexico is such that in some places we find men who are unable to support their families because of lack of employment. No enforcement official is going to be able to keep them from coming into this country where jobs are available at pay scales far above those of Mexico.

There has been much talk here of the need for a bilateral contract and in this I am in accord but for years we have had a contract which has been bilateral in name only because Mexico has virtually dictated its terms. They have taken advantage of labor shortages during peak harvest and our Government has had to accept the terms as laid out by Mexico. If we are given the authority to take unilateral action in writing a contract for the protection of those who come legally into this country seeking employment then Mexico will be more amenable to entering into a bilateral contract which is fair to both countries.

It must be stressed that this legislation provides protection for local citizens who desire to do this type of labor. No man will be imported to do this labor unless the Secretary of Labor certifies that there is a labor shortage in the area. To protect local labor from having this measure used to cut their wages it also provides that these men should not be paid less than the prevailing wage.

Mexico has gone so far as to demand that these imported laborers be paid not a prevailing wage but a minimum wage and I do not believe that imported labor should be given rights that are not as yet afforded to our own citizens.

I hope that some of the people here who seem so concerned with Mexico will show the same concern toward citizens of these United States who are trying to protect its economy.

It is my conviction that much of the opposition in Mexico to this program stems from wealthy farmers in northern Mexico who resent seeing their labor paid the relatively high wages paid in this country in comparison to those they pay in Mexico.

It is quite true that in some sections of our country and in particular some categories of work we have a labor surplus. But I can cite a last week's newspaper article from my home town of McAllen, Tex., which shows farmers in that section have placed applications for hundreds of laborers with the Texas Employment Office guaranteeing a minimum wage of 50 cents an hour and that they had been unable to fill these applications with local citizens.

Frankly, I think it is fortunate that in the times of peak harvest we do not have sufficient local labor to gather the crops for if we did, these same citizens would be unemployed throughout the rest of year. From the standpoint of local citizens it is far better that they have year around employment and that labor be imported only during the peak harvest to be certain that the crops are not allowed to rot in the fields.

I assure you that if we are successful in working out a fair contract to the farmer and employee that the combination of the stable supply of labor resulting from it to take care of our peak harvest and the expected increase in appropriations for the border patrol will result in a great deal of progress in solving our wetback problem by cutting down the incentive for the employment of illegal aliens. Legal entrants will have the full protection of our laws whereas wetbacks are subject to exploitation with no legal remedy available.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear from what has been said that if some of the Members had the time to read the hearings that were presented in support of this resolution many of the objections that have been raised would not have been raised.

A good example was the completely unfounded argument just advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. He said he is opposed to this resolution because thousands of Mexican nationals would be processed to work in this country and then the Mexican Government would probably not permit them to return to their homeland. If he had made an inquiry, or if he had read the hearings, he would never have made such an argument. On page 5 of the hearings Mr. Siciliano—Assistant Secretary of Labor Rocco C. Siciliano—stated:

> It is against their constitution to try to prohibit the entry or exits of their people. That is what they maintain when we ask them to try to keep their wetbacks back.

They have raised the old argument about wetbacks, when any one who is interested in the facts can read the RECORD and know that this bill has no connection whatever with the wetback problem except that it would aid the immigration officials in dealing with them. It is easy to understand why any one who is in favor of freedom of wetback movement would be opposed to this resolution. It is easy to understand why those who do not want aliens who come across the border screened so as to better prevent Communists and subversives from coming in would be opposed to this legislation. Apparently the opponents do not want any control or any processing or any screening of those who enter from Mexico. I favor such screening and such processing and I am therefore naturally in favor of this resolution.

I assume the rule will be readily adopted, and I wish to address myself briefly to the merits of the pending resolution. It is of the utmost importance that it be promptly approved by the Congress.

If the urgency of this measure is fully understood I have no doubt of its prompt approval. Therefore, I shall discuss the facts, the background, and the necessity of this legislation. I first call attention to the fact that the resolution was reported by the Agriculture Committee, after exhautsive hearings, with but two dissening votes.

It is strongly supported by the Department of State, by the Justice Department, by the Labor Department, and by the Department of Agriculture. It is endorsed by the American Farm Bureau, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Grange, and by scores of other farm and grower organizations.

I am sure the purpose of the legislation is understood. I shall briefly refer to that. Public Law 78 of the 82d Congress begins as follows:

> SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

That law then spells out the general terms and conditions under which an international labor agreement can be negotiated and carried out with Mexico.

Public Law 78 does not expire until December 31, 1955. But the migrant labor agreements last but a year at a time. The last one expired on January 1, 1954. It was extended to January 15 by mutual agreement while negotiations for a new agreement were going on. But no new agreement was made and since January 15 there has been none. Following the expiration on January 15 this Government began unilateral processing of Mexican nationals who presented themselves at our border recruitment stations. Then the question arose concerning the authorization for money to be expended in pursuance of the special recruiting procedures set forth in Public Law 78. The Comptroller General on January 18 ruled that procedures contained in Public Law 78 could be used only when an international labor agreement with Mexico was in force and effect. The border recruitment stations were then promptly closed.

The purpose of House Resolution 355 is to amend Public Law 78 so as to permit the special recruiting procedures therein set forth to be usable regardless of whether an international agreement is or is not in effect. In other words, it would permit the use of the special procedures contained in that law in carrying out unilateral processing of Mexican farm workers who present themselves, legally, at border recruitment stations in the United States.

WOULD ALLEVIATE WETBACK PROBLEM

I repeat that in debating this legislation it must be kept in mind that this is not a wetback bill, except that its passage would alleviate the wetback problem by enabling Mexican farm workers to be processed and gain a legal status and thereby enjoy much more desirable wage guaranties and working conditions than they would have as illegal wetbacks.

That arrangment would, of course, tend to deter the movement of wetbacks who cross the border and would reduce the number and enable our immigration officers to maintain better control over them. That view was expressed by the Department of Justice in its report to the Agriculture Committee. The Deputy Attorney General stated:

It is the view of the Department that enactment of such legislation is of urgent importance to the efficient administration of the immigration laws of the United States, and to the needs of a substantial part of the agricultural economy of the western and southwestern United States.

So this legislation has nothing to do with the wetback problem, as such, except that it would reduce the number of illegal entrants and better enable our immigration officials to cope with them.

NEGOTIATIONS HAMPERED BY MEXICO

Let me now give you a little of the background of our prior negotiations of labor agreements with Mexico and some of the perplexing difficulties that have arisen in the application. For 12 years we have had migrant labor agreements with Mexico whereby Mexican workers come across and work in agriculture in areas found to be suffering from labor shortages. Throughout the history of the program these imported workers have not been permitted to work in a county or an area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that there is insufficient domestic help available and unless it is shown that diligent efforts have been made to recruit American workers elsewhere than in the immediate locality.

But for some reason or other in recent years it has become increasingly difficult to work out acceptable agreements with Mexico. During the past few years our friends in Mexico have engaged in delays, stalling tactics, bickerings over interpretations, and indulged in other tactics that have been almost intolerable at times. That fact was confirmed by Robert G. Goodwin, Director, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, in his testimony, when he referred to tactics used by Mexican negotiators during proposed labor agreements. Mr. Goodwin stated:

We feel that we have reached agreement in the past at considerable cost to our own interests. The pattern that has been followed regularly on the part of Mexican officials is a delaying tactic until we get into a position where the labor is so desperately needed here that we have to agree to whatever conditions are put forth. You can take the experience, the history of the negotiations with Mexico each time that they have been conducted in the past, and the pattern has been exactly that. The reason we do not have an agreement this time is because we have taken a firm position against that, including a firm position against delays.

But since, as Mr. Goodwin indicated, many of these actions arose at times when, without such Mexican labor, millions of dollars worth of crops would rot in the fields without the use of that only source of labor, our Government and our employers have buckled under the extreme emergencies and demands of the occasion. As is often true with appeasement, it has seemed that yielding at one time on one issue simply served to encourage more unreasonable and almost unconscionable demands to be made subsequently.

The simple fact is that our Government has yielded, appeased, and given in to the point that a showdown became virtually inevitable as to the making of agreements and good faith respect for them after they are made. Our Government is to be commended for taking this forthright and proper stand, and this Congress should without equivocation support that realistic policy.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Since when has this country become so weak that we have to turn to other nations to tell us whom we are going to send out, what aliens we are going to admit, or what aliens we are going to send out?

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes; the gentleman is so correct about that. To listen to some of the arguments that have been made against this measure you would think we are incapable of doing our own legislating on domestic legislation—and this is a domestic issue, pure and simple. This deals with conditions under which we in this country will employ aliens from Mexico who enter this country legally, through regular ports of entry. It applies to them only after we have assumed sovereignty over them. As the able gentleman from New Mexico has so properly pointed out, we should be able to determine our own policies with regard to those we permit to come in and those we desire to send out.

Mr. Speaker, in order to fully understand the necessity for this legislation and to comprehend the problem from our Government's standpoint and the need for a showdown, it is important that we be apprised of some of the difficulties we have faced in the execution of the agreements in the past. Let me talk about that for a moment.

One development had to do with Mexico summarily closing the recruiting center at Monterrey, which was the only one within a reasonable distance of the border. Other centers were located several hundred miles deep in the interior of Mexico, very inconvenient to our people who found it necessary to go to them. Our Government protested the closing at Monterrey, but to no avail. It was closed by the unilateral action of the Mexican Government.

Now, that action by Mexico not only added to the inconvenience of American citizens but aggravated the problem of our border officials in controlling the entry of wetbacks. The reason for that is obvious. There are tens of thousands of unemployed, poverty-stricken people in northern Mexico, living in the proximity of the northern border. In order for them to come in legally they had to travel hundreds of miles into the interior of Mexico to the recruiting centers. If they went there they might or might not be accepted. So, faced with that dilemma, thousands of them, with hungry families to feed, evidently crossed the border and sought employment. It is obvious that the further into Mexico the recruiting centers are located, the more inaccessible they are to the Mexican workers in the border area, the more tempted they are to cross the border illegally. Therefore, our Government protested the closing at Monterrey, but, as I have said, to no avail.

Another development had to do with wages. Article 15 of the last migrant-labor agreement, which expired on January 15, provided:

The employer shall pay the Mexican worker not less than the prevailing wage rate paid to a domestic worker for similar work at the time the work was performed and in the manner paid within the area of employment, or at the rate prevalent in the work contract, whichever is higher. Determination of the prevailing wage rate shall be made by the Secretary of Labor.

Despite the provision in the agreement to the effect that wages paid to Mexican workers had to be the prevailing wage, determined by our Secretary of Labor, on May 8, 1953, the Mexican Government announced a scale of minimum wages for all workers contracted in the future. That was directly contrary to the international agreement, which I have quoted. Here is the wording, a pertinent part of the announcement made in a note from the Mexican Government:

In view of the foregoing and based on the statistical data and salary graphs of the wages received in the year 1952 by the Mexican contract laborers, compared to the averages of the prevailing wages in those regions where American laborers are employed for the same agricultural task, the Government of Mexico has arrived at the following conclusions. First, every request from employers who wish to engage Mexican workers must be refused when the offered salary is lower than the minimum initial rates of $2.75 for the first hand picking of 100 pounds of cotton, the minimum wage rates being proportionately adjusted for picking under different conditions as well as for other types of agricultural laborers, and, second, that as a general rule it is proper to establish for all agricultural regions which employ Mexican laborers an increase of the hourly wage fixing an initial minimum of not less than 65 cents for the States of the Southeast, of 75 cents for the Middle West, and of 60 cents for the Western States.

That quotation is from an official translation by the Foreign Office of the Mexican note. It is directly contrary to the international agreement.

Here is another one. Although the agreement contains no authorization for Mexico to fix the subsistance rate for the workers recruited on contract—that being determinable under the terms of the agreement by our Secretary of Labor—in Arkansas, western Texas, and New Mexico employers were coerced into paying a subsistance rate fixed by the Mexican consul as a condition of obtaining workers. These illegal demands had to be met or the employers were faced with great crop losses.

UNILATERAL BLACKLISTING

Another of those many developments had to do with blacklisting—unilateral blacklisting, of American employers or of areas or counties, by the Mexican Government, again directly contrary to the plain and unambiguous wording of the international agreement. Under that agreement if a complaint arose the

exact procedure was set out whereby a joint hearing would be held before any blacklisting could take place. It did not outlaw blacklisting, but simply required a hearing before it could take place. But completely ignoring that agreement, Mexico engaged in repeated unilateral actions of summarily blacklisting counties, areas, and individuals, without any sort of hearing and without any warning whatever.

Another arbitrary and unauthorized interpretation of the agreement on the part of Mexico had to do with insurance. Here is the wording of a pertinent part of article 6 of the work contract on that subject:

> No deduction shall be made from the Mexican worker's wages except as provided in this article. The employer may make the following deductions only: For insurance plans when authorized by the Mexican Government under an insurance plan covering nonoccupational injuries and diseases, when such plan has been approved by that Government.

It was developed during the hearings that for 2 years from August 1951 to June 1953 this provision was interpreted to be permissive, rather than mandatory on the part of the employer. In June 1953, just 6 months prior to the expiration of the agreement, and after a Mexican official from the Foreign Ministry had spent considerable time visiting employers and insurance companies on this side of the border, the Mexican Government suddenly announced that they construed article 6 to be mandatory and that employers were required to make the necessary deductions when authorized to do so by the Mexican Government.

The Mexican Government did not stop there. Employers were told that they must take that insurance from certain companies selected by the Mexican Government, and no others. Mr. Goodwin told the committee:

> There seems to be no logical basis for the manner in which these insurance companies were selected.

Mr. Goodwin went on to tell the committee that in some cases the rates of the approved companies were higher than those of companies not approved. Some of the unapproved companies with lower rates had been previously commended by the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Affairs for the fine service they had rendered to Mexican workers and the promptness with which they paid their claims.

Here, Mr. Speaker, was what appears to me to have been a rather highhanded solicitation of insurance for certain companies—only 2 or 3 of them—to the exclusion of all others. It was completely unilateral on the part of Mexico.

Another example can be cited of a demand made by a Mexican consul that employers in Dona Ana County, N. Mex., as a condition of extending the contracts of Mexican workers then and there employed, that they purchase and pay for life insurance for these workers. The agreement authorized no such requirement. And when the employer replied that there was no contractual obligation to pay for such life insurance, the employers were notified that they would be blacklisted because of their uncooperative attitude.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt at some length on the developments wherein the Mexican Government has, time after time, unilaterally and summarily made interpretations and demands under the migrant-labor agreements. From this I think you can readily understand what I meant when at the beginning of my statement I said a showdown with the Mexican Government became inevitable.

POINTS OF DIFFERENCE

I shall now refer to a few of the points of difference between the two governments which the negotiators could not agree upon. First, our negotiators very properly insisted that some concession be made by Mexico with respect to the location of the Mexican recruitment centers. Our representatives felt that at least some of the recruiting should be possible within a reasonable distance of the border. But Mexico made no concession.

Secondly, our Government insisted that Mexico's demand for a fixed, minimum wage could not be granted because it is unauthorized under American law. But Mexico nevertheless persisted in that demand.

Another problem was that of subsistance allowance for the Mexico workers. After the unhappy experience some of our employers had been subjected to in respect to illegal and exorbitant demands from Mexican officials under the old agreement, it was very proper and indeed imperative that a detailed, spelled-out, precise agreement on that point be inserted. But Mexico would not yield on that point.

Another difference had to do with insurance. Our Government insisted on limiting the Mexican Government to approving the coverage desired for nonoccupational insurance and the full cost paid by the worker. On this Mexico made no concession.

Still another difference had to do with worker responsibility. It is known from experience that about 15 or 20 percent of the braceros who are processed leave their jobs without cause. They are known as "skippers." This practice has resulted in considerable financial loss and inconvenience to the employers. Our negotiators very properly insisted that the employer be allowed to withhold several days of the workers' pay until he finished his contract. That would help deter the worker from violating his work agreement. But again our negotiators were rebuffed in that very reasonable suggestion.

BORDER RECRUITMENT NEEDED

After weeks and weeks of negotiations, from last October to January, not a single major concession was made by Mexico on these various points of disagreement. After January 15 our Government did a very proper thing: Processing centers were opened on this side of the border. Mexican nationals legally in this country were processed there until the program was closed down due to the Comptroller General's ruling. The passage of this resolution will enable that border recruiting to be resumed. It is hard to understand why there should be any objection to that. It has to do with a domestic problem—that of processing laborers who are legally in this country. To listen to some of the opponents of this legislation you would think these people are to be processed to work in Mexico and that we are therefore invading the jurisdiction of that country. This is an American problem. It does not deal with anything in Mexico. It does permit Mexican nationals to be processed—but only when they are legally in the United States as our guests and with our sovereignty extending over them while they are here.

CIO OPPOSES

It is true that the CIO and the AFL, or certain segments of those unions, have raised objections. But the CIO frankly announced through R. J. Thomas that it is opposed to any workers whatever coming over at this time, legally or illegally, agreement or no agreement. Apparently the CIO either does not know, or is not interested in, the fact that except for imported Mexican labor, American dinner tables would be denied thousands of tons of food.

UNILATERAL PROCESSING

It has been contended that this legislation is bad because it would permit unilateral processing—meaning processing of Mexican labor without consultation with Mexico. So what? This is our country, is it not? We have immigration laws which authorize unilateral processing of foreign labor. It is already the law without passing this measure. The Attorney General has pointed out that the general immigration laws might be invoked to meet this problem. But he says the specialized procedures contained in Public Law 78 are more desirable and their application would be much less expensive and more feasible than resort to the facets of our general immigration laws that apply to importation of farmworkers. Yes; the Attorney General has authority to process Mexican workers now, under existing immigration laws, and do so unilaterally. I have not heard that the existence of this law has disrupted international relations to any extent. Just who, Mr. Speaker, are we representing here today—the United States or Mexico?

Our Mexican friends, for whom I have great respect and admiration, are quite capable of looking after themselves. I have not heard of any Mexican congressmen objecting to the passage of laws in Mexico City which deal with domestic problems and which might not be to the liking of certain Americans. And I do not blame them a bit.

I do not recall that the United States was consulted when the Mexican Congress passed a law to expropriate property of great value owned by American oil companies a few years ago. I doubt that there was a single Mexican congressman who stood up and represented the United States on that occasion. And I do not blame him. That was Mexico's business. She acted in accord with her sovereign rights.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman or I sought employment down there in Mexico we would be employed under the Mexican law, would we not?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And the United States would have absolutely nothing to do with terms and conditions or wages, would it?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And neither the gentleman nor I nor any other Member of the American Congress protested that action because we recognize that Mexico was a sovereign nation and it had the right to do as it pleased in its own territory.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

What about the bill passed by the Mexican Congress a few years ago which expropriated valuable property owned by American oil companies? That was a unilateral action. It was directed primarily at American citizens. When that drastic measure was being considered not a single Mexican Congressman arose to represent the United States, and I do not blame them one bit. Whether we agree with the wisdom and propriety of that action or not, the fact remains that it was an exercise of a right and a prerogative of a sovereign government, and I would defend them to the end in the right to exercise that right.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is about time that more people assume the responsibility of speaking for the American Government when we are dealing with domestic issues that affect our own sovereignty and our own country instead of spending so much of their time speaking here in behalf of foreign countries whose citizens, while guests in the United States, become the subject of regulation and control by laws which this American Congress seeks to enact.

Nor did any Mexican Congressman represent us when the Mexican Congress passed a law a few years ago which limits the right of American citizens to have gainful employment in Mexico. That comes under the head of Mexico's business. So far as I know, not a single Mexican Congressman represented us when a law was passed down there which prohibits a foreigner from purchasing real estate within 100 kilometers of the border, and limits and restricts the ownership of other property elsewhere in Mexico. Again, I do not blame the Mexican Congress. That was an action by a sovereign government, and even though many Americans were adversely affected, I certainly did not expect a Mexican Congressmen to represent us. The Mexican Congressmen did what you or I would have done: They looked after their own country without regard to the incidental and adverse effect the action might have on Americans.

MEXICO ACTS UNILATERALLY

But if you are going to say that it is bad to do things unilaterally, let us take a leaf from Mexico's book on that score. What about Mexico unilaterally blacklisting our citizens and our counties and areas?

What about Mexico unilaterally setting minimum wages, directly contrary to the migrant labor agreement?

What about Mexico, contrary to the agreement, unilaterally and summarily, setting a subsistance allowance for Mexican workers above the amount previously arrived at in accordance with the agreement; and which, by the way, was determined by our Government to be exorbitant and unreasonable as well as illegal?

And what about Mexico unilaterally and summarily demanding that our employers purchase certain insurance for Mexican workers, to be taken with companies named by the Mexican Government? And remember this was contrary to the wording of the international agreement.

I could go on and on, but time is short. Again I ask: Who are we representing here today—Mexico or the United States? The Mexican people are good traders. They are sharp and crafty, and from their standpoint I say "Power to them." They have been having their way, pretty well, in these agreements for years. When they have agreed to something they did not like they just unilaterally and summarily interpreted it to fit their own desires. And they have been getting by with it. Now their hand has at last been called, and here today we can sustain our own Government in having all this "monkey business" on the part of Mexico cut out.

When our Mexican friends find they must do business with us on a different basis from what they have been, you will see a little different attitude. This resolution will vastly improve the chances for a new agreement to be arrived at. It will place our negotiators in a much better position. The fact is that in regard to these workers Mexico needs us as much or even more than we need the Mexican workers. And they know it. It means more than $150 million a year of American money pumped into the economy of Mexico. And that is a lot of money anywhere, more particularly in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, appeasement has been tried on other occasions between nations and has failed. As a general rule too much of it, whether between individuals or Nations, simply does not work very well. And we have a good example of it here.

Again, I ask what is there so wrong and evil about unilateral processing? It is our own business. We have been practicing it for years, and are doing so now, with respect to Canadian workers who come across by the thousands to work in our lumber camps of the north woods. It was practiced for decades by this Government along the Mexican border prior to a few years ago when this international agreement fad got into the picture. And it can and will work very well right now.

I am sure we all hope an acceptable international labor agreement can be negotiated with Mexico. One probably will be eventually, particularly if this resolution is enacted. But right now it is imperative that this amendment to Public Law 78 be passed. We are faced with an emergency in the Southwest. This is planting time. It is lambing time and shearing time on the ranches. It is harvesttime in many of the vegetable fields. And there is not even half enough labor available to meet the minimum requirements.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is a very important principle involved in this simple joint resolution which is before us, or which I hope will be before us upon the adoption of the rule. This principle has very little to do with much of the subject of the debate as it has gone on in this last hour.

The principle involved is simply this: Shall we, the Government of the United States, continue to exercise jurisdiction over the entrance of foreigners, aliens, into our country? I do not think that this particular problem has ever actually been debated in the Halls of Congress before. I think it has always been taken for granted, Mr. Speaker, that the United States runs its own business with respect to who may be admitted inside our borders. A few years ago the Congress passed a bill which gave to the Republic of Mexico the courtesy of joining with us in an agreement regarding the admission of people who would perform labor in this country under certain conditions. We extended the Government of Mexico the courtesy of making an agreement with us. It was purely that and nothing more. We were not bound in any way to have done it; it was not necessary that we do that, because people are entering our country under our laws right along without any such agreement. But we did make that arrangement in the statute enacted regarding this labor program. Now the Government of Mexico appears not to be willing to recognize this courtesy and to deal with us in a manner which would seem to our people to be reasonable and mutually satisfactory. I see nothing except a good, forthright American principle in the idea of passing this joint resolution, which simply says, "Unfortunately, if we cannot have a satisfactory arrangement with you, we must withdraw that courtesy."

Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us merely asserts the right of the United States to have control over the entrance of people into our country—nothing more.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, if this bill is passed here today, we will have an agreement with Mexico satisfactory to our authorities, and we will have that agreement before this bill gets to the President for signature. If we do not have this bill passed, we can have an agreement with Mexico only if we capitulate to the ever-growing demands of Mexico. If this bill is not passed and we do not have an agreement with Mexico, then the result will be that we will take a step backward to the prewar days when the wetbacks came over without any control, without any agreement, and without any regulations, and when the Mexican laborer was exploited, and through the exploitation of the Mexican our own labor was exploited. So, this bill is not only necessary; it is imperative that we pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will vote for this rule and let us present to the House the arguments for the necessity of this bill. We already have a law that permits these agreements, but Mexico is coming to realize that by that law we placed ourselves in a straitjacket where they can dictate the terms and we can agree or go without. We want to get along with our good neighbors, but for months now we have been unable to come to an agreement because our authorities do not have anything to bargain with, they do not have the alternative that this bill would give them. The sooner we take them out of their straitjackets, the sooner they can negotiate effectively.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is regretted that this legislation provoked such a controversy. We have been having it almost every year since the war, call it agricultural labor, braceros, wetbacks, or whatever it is. This bill should have the support of every Member of this House. It is not a partisan bill, it is not a labor bill, but this bill is for the good of the United States, and everybody, I think, in America would support it if they understood it, except maybe a few farmers right along the border who are not concerned. They might just as well continue employing illegal Mexicans, but this is to make the employment of Mexican labor legal. We need them not only in Texas, Arizona, and California, but I would like to have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] know that last year 27 States of the 48 employed Mexican labor, because we do not have stoop labor any more in the United States. We have to get it from some source, and of all those unemployed he referred to, you will not get one of them to pick cotton, potatoes, sugarbeets, or do the necessary menial jobs that these Mexicans are willing to do in coming over here and earning these Yankee dollars.

I hope the entire House will support this legislation despite the fact that there a few farmers on the border who would be very happy to continue without legislation. This unilateral agreement that is proposed here will enable the Labor Department to enforce certain regulations that have been in force since 1948, legalizing these Mexicans rather than letting them come over illegally.

I was surprised that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] would repeat such a ridiculous statement as that about 1,200 Communists coming across at El Paso. He knew there was nothing to that. He is too smart a man to fall for that kind of baloney. An irresponsible man made that statement while he was acting as director of a service here. I am surprised the gentleman from New York would even use it in his talk, because it is so utterly ridiculous.

I am also surprised at the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I usually think he does a marvelous job on immigration affairs. But this bill merely makes it legal so the Department of Labor can continue to operate as it has been doing in the last several years in the legal process of handling these Mexicans rather than the illegal method of letting them come across and get work without being properly processed, which in turn might promote the entry of Communists and some of the other ill things it has been suggested might happen.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], who is unable to be here today, to insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the migratory farm worker remains the greatest social problem in the United States. Twice, during the 6 years I have been in Congress, the Congress has passed legislation establishing conditions under which agricultural workers might legally be imported from Mexico. The second of these acts is still in effect.

I have opposed this legislation each time that it has been presented to the House of Representatives; first, because of the inadequacies of the legislation; second, because it completely ignored the problem of the migratory worker who is a citizen of the United States; and third, because it did little or nothing to stop the flow of illegal workers crossing the border from Mexico. The legislation which we passed in the last session of Congress still has 2 years to run. What is proposed here today is a further weakening of an already inadequate piece of legislation. This legislation, and all similar legislation, should be rejected until such time as a reasonable effort is made to meet the problem of the migratory worker.

The international contracts previously agreed upon by our Government and that of Mexico have stipulated a minimum wage and included requirements regarding housing, health, unemployment, and death. No such safeguards are granted to American migratory workers. Citizens in the United States working in the same fields, or displaced by imported labor, do not have even a minimum of protection by social legislation. When I proposed last year that American citizens working in competition with imported labor on crops that are supported at 90 percent of parity or subsidized under the Sugar Act be paid at least 90 percent of the minimum wage, my proposal was rejected by the chairman of the committee handling the migratory labor bill on a point of order. It seems only fair that this provision should be written into law, so as to give at least a minimum of protection to American citizens competing in this labor market. As the system now works, the influx of both legal and illegal labor from Mexico into southern Texas sets up a chain reaction which results in the displacement of farm workers throughout the West and Southwest. For 3 or 4 months of the year these people have uncertain employment, and, in turn, themselves become migrants. The present situation, marked by disorder and neglect and, in some cases, by exploitation, verges on the scandalous.

Rather than pass this legislation, Congress should give attention to passing legislation to establish a Federal Committee for Migratory Labor as recommended by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor and should work with State legislatures, farmers associations, agriculture labor unions, and religious organizations, and other groups, preliminary to passing legislation to establish some order in the field of migratory farm labor.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, this Mexican labor problem comes before us today under circumstances much worse than ever before when we were giving consideration to legislation to amend, clarify, and approve agreements that had been reached between our Government and the Government of Mexico regarding our use and conditions under which at least limited numbers of screened and approved Mexican agriculture workers would be permitted legal and limited entry into this country during the Southwest harvesting season.

Today the problem is at its worst for the reason that no agreement has been reached between the two Governments and, of course, can result in a terrible state of exploitation and illegal entry of a million of nothing more or less than what we have termed in the past as wetbacks. No method of screening them as safe risks, no check on them for return to their homeland, and with no contract to cover their pay, their care and housing, transportation and policing, what a mess it will create for everyone except the industrialized farm owner and grower who, of course, has always sought their cheap labor. Without a contract this Mexican labor will be used to drive down labor costs in our present surplus labor market.

Like myself, I am sure many of the Members have received a copy of the very graphic and enlightening book put out last summer by the Texas State Federation of Labor on this subject and problem. I read every page of it and surely if anyone has to live with this problem day in and day out the labor movement of Texas ought to be qualified to speak with a lot of knowledge and authority on the subject.

In addition to that, I have just read over again and refreshed my memory on the facts presented in the President's Commission Reports on Problems of Migrant Workers, which I am briefly cutting down and making a part of my remarks at this time:

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION REPORTS PROBLEMS OF MIGRANT WORKERS

WASHINGTON.—For the first time an official United States Government commission has put on the record the discriminations, persecutions, and sufferings imposed on the migrant farm workers of America.

Almost everyone of these problems has been depicted and decried by the AFL National Farm Labor Union and the AFL but now they are verified and confirmed officially by President Truman's Commission on Migrant Farm Labor. Here are highlights from the Commission report:

LARGE GROWERS, UNITED STATES BLAMED

The report deals with the plight of 1 million migratory farm workers, of whom half are domestic migrants. The other half is made up of 400,000 illegal Mexican wetbacks (persons who cross the border by swimming or wading or just walking) and 100,000 Mexicans legally here under contract, and a small number of British West Indians and Puerto Ricans.

Some of the evils which the Commission says it found during its 8 months' investigation were pinned on the large industrial growers, many of whom deal with so-called contractor and crew leaders. These last-named bear no direct responsibility to the migratory workers.

The Commission, too, discovered an anomaly in the employment conditions of migratory farm workers. Alien workers, such as those who come here from Mexico, for example, are, by intergovernmental treaty, guaranteed employment, minimum wages, workmen's compensation, medical care, housing, and sanitation standards. But domestic migrants not only have no protection through collective bargaining but employers refuse to accord to them the guarantees they extend to imported alien farm workers.

It was emphasized by the Commission that the problems under study were not primarily those of the poor little farmer, but were largely confined to conditions on about 125,000 farms which amount to 2 percent of the farms of the Nation and produce crops equal to approximately 7 percent of the value of all farm products.

IMPORTS NOT NEEDED

The conclusion that it is not necessary to import aliens in large numbers during the present emergency is supported broadly by this argument:

Estimated farm output for 1951 is 3.6 percent above 1949. If this additional output were to require an equal percentage increase in man-hours then we would need about 700 million additional hours to produce the 1951 output.

These additional man-hours could be supplied by the present domestic labor force, including farm family labor, if each worker put in 6½ more days per year. And, even at that, they would be working 3 days fewer per year than in 1945. The average hired farm worker who in 1949 was getting only 90 days of farm work—23 fewer than in wartime—would be willing, if given the opportunity, to contribute this amount and more.

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS ANNUAL EARNINGS

Comparing the hourly earnings of farm laborers and factory workers the commission reported that during 1910–14, the period designated by Congress as the base for the farm parity price system, farm wages were two-thirds of factory wages. Today they are a little more than one-third.

Actual average hourly earnings of farm workers in 1950 was 55 cents and those of factory workers $1.45. In 1910–14 the comparable figures were 14 and 21 cents.

Notwithstanding prerequisites furnished by employers such as housing and transportation, the commission finds that farm workers' annual earnings, compared with the pay of factory workers are even worse than is suggested by relative wage rates because factory employees get more work than farm employees.

Whereas average cash earnings of factory workers in 1949 were $2,600, average earnings for both migratory and nonmigratory farm workers were only slightly more than $500.

BARGAINING NEEDED

The commission said it was convinced that balanced organization and effective collective bargaining would be of great assistance not only to farm workers but that it would also contribute to more orderly management of labor. Adoption of the system would, for instance, eliminate the labor contractor and middleman and the "sweatshop conditions that are frequently associated with them," the report said.

It was recommended that the Taft-Hartley Act be amended to cover employees on farms having a specified minimum employment.

UNITED STATES RELAXES VIGILANCE

The official vigilance during World War II that provided for temporary admission of alien farm workers was abandoned in the postwar years, the report points out.

Since then, responsible Government administrative agencies have ceased putting forth efforts to preserve national immigration policy, the report continues.

The Commission, in fact, found that the importation of alien farm workers since the war had been on a larger scale than during the war.

The result is that temporary foreign laborers have come to furnish "the very competition to American labor that it is the purpose of the immigration law to prevent."

PHONY SHORTAGE CERTIFIED

The report describes what the Commission considers the inadequacies in the method of ascertaining whether a farm labor shortage exists.

The farmers, it was pointed out, meet at the beginning of the season and decide unilaterally what the prevailing wage is to be. The rate is usually low before the season begins, and so, the report finds, it is possible that insufficient domestic labor is attracted. Therefore a "labor shortage" can be said to exist "at that price."

Since foreign workers cannot be imported until the United States Employment Service certifies that a shortage exists, this apparent lack of applicants becomes the basis for the necessary certification.

To safeguard the interests of domestic farm labor and to avoid, so far as possible, discrimination that favors imported alien contract labor, the Commission proposes that "no certification of shortage of domestic labor should be made unless and until continental domestic labor has been offered the same terms and conditions of employment as are offered to foreign workers."

NO WORKER SPOKESMEN

The Farm Placement Division in the United States Employment Service, according to the Commission, is more sucecssful in winning the confidence and cooperation of employers than of the migratory workers.

"This seems to be due to the fact that in practice the service places greater emphasis on its function as a recruiting agency for farm employers than it does on the equally important function of a work-finding agency for the migratory farm laborers," the Commission points out.

These practices "have convinced the Commission that the employment service conceives its functions as rather narrow and limited. Moreover its activities are marked by a certain onesidedness in favor of corralling supplies of migratory farm workers to meet growers' labor demand regardless of the effect on the workers."

The general attitude of the Farm Placement Division which impressed the Commission as "one-sided" was that although Congress, in establishing the United States Employment Service, provided for a Federal Advisory Council representing workers, employers and the public, the Farm Placement Service (a part of the Federal Employment Service) has disregarded this tripartite principle. Instead, it has organized and depended for advice on a Special Farm Labor Committee, composed wholly of farm employers and their representatives.

WETBACKS AND THEIR GREEDY EMPLOYERS A DISGRACE TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, they sneak across the Rio Grande from Mexico, aided and abetted by large farmers, ranchers, and growers associations, to work for starvation wages.

That is why they are called wetbacks.

It is easy for thousands of them to slip through the long boundary between Mexico and the United States because our border patrol is kept at skeleton strength with the connivance of agricultural employers in the United States who want to fatten themselves by exploiting cheap labor.

The tragedy and the treason of this situation is that it is being encouraged by every devious practice at a time when unemployment is mounting among our people. There is no need whatsoever for imported farm help, when there is a growing surplus of American labor.

Those who encourage this modern slavery in the Southwest wrap themselves in the American flag whenever there is a bill to liberalize immigration from Europe that would bring skilled refugees to our country. They shout about the dangers of communism when we are trying to provide sancutary for a few more of communism's victims. But they flout every consideration of security when they smell the profits that will accrue to themselves by opening the borders to migrant Mexican workers. They ignore the warning by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that more than 100 Communists a day are coming in through our back door. Our whole security setup becomes a farce when the precautions we exercise along the Canadian border, and at all west coast, east coast, and gulf ports, are abandoned along the 2,000-mile Mexican border, because special interests here put selfishness above patriotism.

It is to the credit of the Mexican Government and evidence of its concern for the welfare of its own nationals that it wants to engage in joint supervision of this problem. There was such an agreement, but it expired on January 15, 1954. Mexico will not renew this pact unless it contains minimum guaranties covering wages and conditions of work.

Meanwhile, irresponsible farmers, ranchers, and growers—and there is a growing suspicion of collusion between them and the United States Government—have been recruiting wetbacks legally and illegally to reap "grapes of wrath" all over again.

The shameful conditions under which these migrant laborers live endanger the public health, undermine educational standards, lower the level of economic activity, and provoke social tensions. The wages paid them by their slave mas-

ters in the United States degrade them to an animal-like status. This is a threat to farmers and ranchers in other parts of the United States who pay legitimate wages. As these migrant wetbacks spread through the country, they are used by other exploiters to wreck our own labor standards. And the minimum-wage law becomes a travesty on economic justice.

Under these conditions, more people are apt to wonder whether the Communists or these greedy employers are doing more to sabotage the confidence of Americans in their Government.

The scope of the problem, in numbers alone, is revealed by the Government's admission that there were about 500,000 apprehensions of illegal entrants in 1952 as against 839,000 in 1953.

From these figures it is safe to assume that the number of those who were not apprehended is large. This invasion could not be successful without a conspiracy to evade the laws of the United States.

It is apparent, therefore, that we must crack down—and hard—on those Americans responsible for this deplorable condition.

The present bill would enable the Department of Labor to handle this problem in a unilateral manner, which would be an arrogant attitude, tending to break down the good-neighbor policy between the United States and her friends to the south of us who are rightfully sensitive on this point.

I do not claim that the Mexican Government is without fault on this issue.

Behind the whole question of negotiations between the two governments, and disagreement as to terms, is the much larger and more difficult problem that has never been resolved.

The bootleg traffic in wetbacks is a practice that will not be tolerated by American public opinion. It is an affront to human dignity and a menace to our labor standards.

You can never validate a continuing injustice no matter how you disguise it.

Unilateral recruitment of Mexican farm labor is un-American to begin with.

Furthermore, it is an insult to our unemployed, and to the absence of any constructive help for them.

House Joint Resolution 355 is a mask that fails to conceal the exploitation of human misery. All the rationalizing in the world cannot conceal the ugly facts.

The reputation of the United States should not be sullied by this type of legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include two telegrams in my remarks on the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this legislation and I hope this rule is adopted. The importation of Mexican nationals for agricultural work in this country has worked out very successfully for a number of years. This type of labor is absolutely essential to the beet-sugar industry in Colorado and other States where sugar beets are raised. I understand that about 3,000 of these nationals were employed in Colorado last year to harvest our crops. While this number is small as compared to the total number imported, this labor is a very important element of our economy. Without this labor, it would be impossible to harvest certain crops.

I am, of course, very anxious to use local labor wherever possible. This resolution provides that the nationals cannot be used where local labor is available. No one has any intention of taking any work away from citizens of this country. However, it has been demonstrated year after year that this type of labor is not available in the United States.

I feel that it is essential to the economy of our Nation that this legislation be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that we may proceed to the adoption of this rule and the adoption of the legislation which will be before us pursuant to the rule. My understanding is that the great Committee on Agriculture by almost a unanimous vote has brought this matter to us for our consideration on the floor of the House. Before I talk about the merits involved here, I want to say I do not know whether or not I understood correctly what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] said. If I understood him, he was at least trying to create the impression that the great President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was for this legislation as a result of some social visit which he made with Governor Shivers, of Texas. We have heard a few things around here lately about name calling, but I want to say I resent that sort of implication and there certainly should be no one in this Chamber who would take any stock whatsover in such a statement. Now, let us not get all mixed up about illegal wetbacks, a name applied supposedly to people wading across the Rio Grande River. I have seen the Rio Grande River a few times, and I do not know whether you could get wet in it or not. But at any rate they walk across illegally. Here we are dealing with the question of legal admission to this country. In order that there be no question about it, and apparently much of this opposition is centered around some sort of contention that the Department of State and the Department of Labor and the Department of Justice do not want this legislation or that the administration does not want it, let me set your minds at rest about that because I can assure you that this legislation would not be here before us today if such were the case. On the contrary, this legislation is desired. It is desired because it is in the national interest and those people having primary charge of the conduct of our foreign affairs as well as the conduct of our affairs here at home favor this legislation and want it to be brought to enactment.

As some of you may have read in the papers, we have certain Monday morning meetings in the city, and as recently as this morning this matter was again discussed. So I say to you, set your minds at rest about that.

Referring again to wetbacks, this is no wetback bill. Somebody said something about stopping the illegal entries at the Mexican border. I just want to say, if some of you will follow certain leadership operations that might be exerted here, we will begin to do something about it. That is one thing that is not involved here unless it can be fairly said that by the adoption of this legislation, which will provide for the legal entry of people needed here, we will avoid, at least in some measure, the problems incident to the wetbacks coming into this country. As a matter of fact, there are about 40,000 of these Mexican workers now in the western part of the country, and if they have to leave it will create a vacuum which will persuade more wetbacks to come in here to meet the situation. Furthermore, some of the gentlemen, who have such a great solicitude for labor in this country, should consider that if these crops are not harvested, then the workers in the sheds, and so forth, will not have jobs, because they will not have anything to work on. Whatever there is in that, I hope they will consider it.

As a matter of fact, my information is that it costs the producers in this country more to hire these Mexican laborers than the prevailing local scale; but you cannot find local people to do the work.

It has otherwise been urged here that what we need is an agreement with Mexico. I concur in that. That is what we want—an agreement. We have been trying to work one out for months and months and months. I am not so certain but what the fact that this resolution has been reported and that action on it is imminent has brought us to the point where, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] pointed out in the paper, it now looks as if an agreement will be worked out. That is what we want. No one disagrees with that. But the question then arises, How best do you get the agreement? I will tell you that one way not to get an agreement is to defeat this rule and this proposed legislation, because just as surely as you do, you are not going to get any agreement, unless it is one that perhaps would ask us to do so much that we would not want to enter into it. That is not the sort of thing that should be talked about here too much, because I realize that we have to maintain friendly relations with everybody.

Do you not have confidence in the people in the executive branch of the Government, who have the primary responsibility for maintaining those relations? I think I can assure you on the best authority that if there were anything destructive or bad to come from the adoption of this resolution, the people in charge would have said so and I would not be here urging its adoption. But because that is not the situation, I am here urging its adoption.

Reference has been made to the farm organizations wanting an agreement. Of course they want an agreement.

Everybody, as I said, wants an agreement. But there again, the fundamental thing is how best are we going to get an agreement? I would hazard a little guess. Let us pass this resolution here today. I trust that some of the Members in opposition to it will be willing to proceed and debate the matter and get a vote on it so that we do not have to call the roll too many times, because we have lots of work to do, and this is one thing we are going to have to conclude because it is a part of the program and needs to be done.

If we can, let us get up to the vote and approach it on its merits and as a starter. I believe you will find these negotiations will be proceeding quite expeditiously and that very shortly we can look for an agreement that will be satisfactory to the Mexican Government and satisfactory to the Government of the United States and will help out in this critical situation which confronts us. I do not know whether any of these people will come to my State of Indiana or not, but it does not make any difference. Here is a proposition that has been urged at the hearings. We have been acting on it for years, going about the same thing, so why not proceed toward action and get on with other business before us.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

RECESS

At approximately 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. a demonstration and the discharge of firearms, from the southwest House Gallery (No. 11), interrupted the counting of the vote; the Speaker, pursuant to the inherent power lodged in the Presiding Officer in the case of grave emergency, after ascertaining that certain Members had been wounded and to facilitate their care, at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m. declared the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Members wounded were: Mr. BENTLEY of Michigan, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FALLON of Maryland, Mr. JENSEN of Iowa, and Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1308. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report on borrowing authority for the quarter ending September 30, 1953, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1309. A letter from the Achivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1310. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Third Annual Report by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics on Operations, pursuant to Public Law 867, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1311. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend subdivision (a) of section 66, 'Unclaimed moneys' of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision (b) of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1312. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 14, 'Discharges, when granted,' of the Bankruptcy Act as amended and subdivision (b) of section 58, 'Notices' of the Bankruptcy Act as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1313. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report presenting a plan for a single-purpose irrigation development in the basin of the Pecan Bayou, a tributary of the Colorado River of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1314. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Tenth Annual Report of the Operation of the Fort Peck project for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 8 (c) of the Fort Peck Project Act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 25, 1954, the following report was filed on February 26, 1954:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Report pursuant to section 5 (a) of Public Law 304 (79th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted March 1, 1954*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4481. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., to acquire interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 7339. A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 8116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to increase the income tax exemptions allowed a taxpayer for himself, his spouse, and his dependents to $700 for the taxable year 1954 and to $800 for succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 8117. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 8118. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 8119. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to certain rodeos, community shows, and festivals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 8120. A bill to make it unlawful for any person having a wife and children dependent upon him to flee to another State or foreign country for the purpose of avoiding his responsibility to provide for their support and maintenance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 8121. A bill relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 8122. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 8123. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 8124. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for certain deduc-

tions for taxpayers and dependents who are physically or mentally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8126. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 8127. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 8128. A bill to modify the requirement for an oath in certain cases in attachment proceedings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8129. A bill to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over; to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 8130. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona or on the Navaho Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico for religious, educational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 8131. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8132. A bill to increase the personal-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 8133. A bill to provide that certain payments to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities shall be measured by average daily membership in the schools of such agencies instead of being measured by average daily attendance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 8134. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) from $600 to $800 for 1954, and to $1,000 for 1955 and succeeding years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 8135. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 8136. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to admission taxes on intercollegiate rowing regattas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 8137. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution providing for the coinage of a medal in recognition of 30 years of the distinguished public service of John Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution authorizing the formulation and carrying out of a program for sending freedom messages behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. J. Res. 458. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in a certain tract of land to the Board of Education of Irwin County, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. J. Res. 459. Joint resolution designating the lake to be formed by the completion of the Texarkana Dam and Reservoir on Sulphur River, about 9 miles southwest from Texarkana, Tex., as Lake Texarkana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Colorado General Assembly urging the President of the United States to defend the freedom and decency of the free world by continuing firmly to oppose admission of Red China to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to a joint resolution expressing support of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 8138. A bill for the relief of Ruben Barrow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 8139. A bill for the relief of Stanley Fiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 8140. A bill for the relief of Domenico Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 8141. A bill for the relief of Friedrich Jakobus Stech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 8142. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sciarrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8143. A bill for the relief of Dr. James Archibald Pabarue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8144. A bill for the relief of Glenn J. McAllister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 8145. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Merkouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8146. A bill for the relief of Palmira Smarrelli (nee Lattanzio); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 8147. A bill for the relief of George W. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 8148. A bill for the relief of Dominick Cardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

534. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 39 residents of Slippery Rock, Pa., opposing the sale of liquor in Army camps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

535. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, American Lithuanian Council of Lake and La Porte Counties, East Chicago, Ind., requesting the United States to use its power and influence to help Lithuania and other Baltic States regain their freedom and sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

536. Also, petition of the chairman, Lithuanian Americans of the City of Racine, Racine, Wis., expressing gratitude to the United States of America for its favorable attitude toward the Lithuanian Nation in its struggle for liberty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

537. Also, petition of the president, Linden, N. J., branch, Lithuanian American Council, Linden, N. J., expressing appreciation for continued encouragement of the ultimate liberation of Lithuania from Bolshevik enslavement, and for the creation of the Kersten committee which investigated seizure and forcible Soviet annexation of Lithuania into Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

538. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Lithuanian Council of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., relative to a resolution adopted at special commemoration ceremonies marking the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

539. Also, petition of the chairman, American Lithuanians of the City of Portland, Portland, Oreg., pledging full cooperation with the present Government of the United States in its efforts to resist the forces of Communist imperialism and achieve international peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

540. Also, petition of the deputy, Board of Supervisors, County of San Diego, San Diego, Calif., opposing the adoption of Senate bill 2749, which provides for the termination of Federal supervision over trust and restricted property of Indian tribes and individual Indians in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

541. Also, petition of the clerk, County Commissioners of Allegany County, Cumberland, Md., requesting the issuance of a commemorative stamp marking the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

542. Also, petition of the mayor of Cumberland, Md., relative to the issuance of a commemorative stamp to mark the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.